



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A 872,533

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

85700

53

VOL. I. NEW SERIES.

JULY—OCTOBER,

MDCCLXIII.

LONDON:
BURNS & LAMBERT, 17 & 18 PORTMAN STREET,
AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.
DERBY: RICHARDSON AND SONS.
1863.

!

11
4
282

LONDON:
COX AND WYMAN, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET,
LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS.

CONTENTS.—No I.

ART.	PAGE
<p>I. POPULAR DEVOTION IN SPAIN.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Historia Ecclesiastica de España. Por D. Vicente de la Fuente. 4 vols. Barcelona : Libreria Religiosa. 1859.</p>	1
<p>II. THE ABYSSINIAN SCHISM</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">1. Ludolfi Historia Æthiopica. Francofurti ad Mænum. 1681. 2. Bruce's Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile. 5 vols. Edinburgh : 1790. 3. The Highlands of Æthiopia. By Major Harris. 3 vols. London : Longmans. 1844. 4. Life in Abyssinia. By Mansfield Parkyns. 2 vols. London : J. Murray. 1853. 5. Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours in Eastern Africa. By the Rev. Dr. Krapf. London : Trübner & Co. 1860. 6. Wanderings among the Fálashas of Abyssinia. By Rev. H. Stern. London : Wertheim, Macintosh, & Hunt. 1862.</p>	33
<p>III. INTRINSIC END OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Du Spirituel et du Temporel dans l'Eglise. Lettre de Mon- seigneur [Paris] l'Evêque d'Arras à Son Excellence M. Thouvenel. Paris : 1860.</p>	66
<p>IV. ROSA FERRUCCI</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Rosa Ferrucci : ses Lettres et sa Mort. Par l'Abbé Henri Perreyve. Paris : Douniol, 1858.</p>	111
<p>V. THE WORK AND THE WANTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">An Account of the State of the Roman-Catholick Religion throughout the World. Written for the use of Pope Innocent XI. by Monsignor Cerri, Secretary of the Congregation de Propa- ganda Fide. Now first translated from an authentick Italian MS. never published. To which is added a Discourse concerning the State of Religion in England ; written in French in the time of King Charles I., and now first translated. With a large Dedi- cation to the present Pope, giving Him a very particular account of the State of Religion amongst Protestants ; and of several other matters of importance relating to Great Britain. By Sir Richard Steele. London : Printed for J. Roberts, near the Oxford Arms, in Warwick Lane. MDCCXV.</p>	139

ART.		PAGE
	<i>Essays and Miscellaneous Literature.</i>	
VI.	HISTORICAL NOTES OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.....	170
	Part. I. From the Beginning of the Movement to the Publication of Tract 90 (exclusive).	
VII.	THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.....	191
VIII.	NOTICES OF BOOKS	220
	Tarquini de Jure Ecclesiastico Publico—Dr. Murray's Tractatus de Ecclesia—Dr. Pusey's Minor Prophets—Armellini de Prisca Refutatione Hæreseon, Origenis Nomine ac Philosophoumenon titulo recens vulgata—Villari's History of Savonarola—Vies de V. Agnès de Jésus ; B. Esprite de Jésus ; V. Jeanne Marie de la Croix ; et Madame Acarie—Wenham's Letter on Management of Schools—Formby's Inquiry of Retired Citizen into Roman Catholic Religion—Stories from Old Testament—The Church Establishment in Ireland, illustrated by Protestant authorities—Robertson's Secret Mission to Danish Islands—MacCarthy on the Memoirs of the Marquis de Villars—Memoir of Dr. Blomfield — Kingsley's Water-Babies — V. Grignon de Montfort's Treatise on True Devotion to B. Virgin — Vita di Francesca de Maistre, con Memorie di Benedetta Medolago Albani—Westlake's Hymns and Sacred Part-Songs—Croiset's Devotion to Sacred Heart—The Lamp—Marshall's Christian Missions—Father Hutchison's Holy House of Loreto.	
IX.	FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE	262
	La Civiltà Cattolica—Le Correspondant.	

CONTENTS.—No. II.

ART.	PAGE
I. DR. HOOK'S LIVES OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY	275
Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., Dean of Chichester. Vol. II. Anglo-Norman Period. Second edition. London : Bentley. 1862.	
II. THE CURÉ OF ARS	322
Le Curé d'Ars. Vie de Jean-Baptiste-Marie Vianney. Publiée sous les yeux et avec l'approbation de Mgr. l'Evêque de Belley. Par l'Abbé Alfred Monnin, Missionnaire. 2 Vols. Paris : Douniol. 1861.	
Life of the Curé d'Ars. From the French of the Abbé Alfred Monnin. Second edition. London : Burns & Lambert. 1863.	
III. PRISON MINISTERS ACT	356
An Act for the Amendment of the Law relating to the Religious Instruction of Prisoners in County and Borough Prisons in England and Scotland. London : Printed by George Edward Eyre & William Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty. 1863.	
IV. THE NEWLY DISCOVERED JEWISH CATACOMBS AT ROME	397
Cimitero degli Antichi Ebrei, scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini. Illustrato per Raffaele Garrucci, D.C.D.G. Roma : Coi Tipi della Civiltà Cattolica. 1862.	
Vetri Ornati di Figure in Oro, trovati nei Cimiteri dei Cristiani Primitivi di Roma. Raccolti e spiegati da Raffaele Garrucci, D.C.D.G. Roma : Salviucci. 1858.	
Letters from Rome to Friends in England. By the Rev. John W. Burgon, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London : Murray. 1862.	
V. THE LETTERS OF S. TERESA.....	419
Lettres de Sainte Térèse, traduites suivant l'ordre chronologique. Edition enrichie de lettres inédites, de notes, et de biographies, par le P. Marcel Bouix, de la Compagnie de Jésus. 3 tom. Paris : Lecoffre et Cie.	

ART.	PAGE
VI. THE DOGMATIC PRINCIPLE.....	458
Undogmatic Christianity. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, May 3, 1863, by the Rev. Walter Waddington Shirley, M.A. London and Oxford : Parker.	
The Unity of Evangelical and Apostolical Teaching. Sermons preached mostly in Canterbury Cathedral. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. London : Murray. 1859.	
VII. THE CATHOLIC CONGRESS OF MALINES	482
Assemblée Générale des Catholiques en Belgique. Première Session à Malines, 18—22 Aout, 1863. Programme des Travaux—Questions—Projets de Solution—Propositions. Bruxelles : Imprimerie de Th. Lesigne.	
<i>Essays and Miscellaneous Papers.</i>	
VIII. HISTORICAL NOTES OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT	494
Part. II.—Tract 90 : its Antecedents, Motives, Object, and immediate Results.	
IX. NOTICES OF BOOKS	509
Mgr. Manning's Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects—Tischendorf's Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum—Valroger's Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres du Nouveau Testament—Schwane's Dogmengeschichte der vorncänischen Zeit—Madden's Galileo and the Inquisition—Lyell and Poole on the Antiquity of Man—Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church—Sighart's Albert le Grand—Mathieu's Livre de Prières—Cartier's Vie de Fra Angelico—Cartier's Dialogue et Lettres de S. Catharine de Sienne—Bouix's Œuvres Spirituelles de S. Pierre d'Alcantara—Bouix's La Solitaire des Rochers—Sixth Report of Inspector appointed to visit Reformatory and Industrial Schools—Parkinson's Lecture on Education—Anderdon's Adventures of Owen Evans—Wood's Glimpses into Petland—Blot's Auxiliatrices du Purgatoire—Question des Sœurs de la Charité en Portugal.	
X. FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE	568
Etudes Religieuses, Historiques et Littéraires—Le Correspondant—La Civiltà Cattolica.	
XI. FOREIGN EVENTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST	583
Polish Insurrection—Fausti Trial—Procession of the Santissimo Salvatore—Neapolitan States—Piedmont and Italy.	

CONTENTS.—No. II.

ART.	PAGE
I. DR. HOOK'S LIVES OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY	275
<p>Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., Dean of Chichester. Vol. II. Anglo-Norman Period. Second edition. London: Bentley. 1862.</p>	
II. THE CURÉ OF ARS	322
<p>Le Curé d'Ars. Vie de Jean-Baptiste-Marie Vianney. Publiée sous les yeux et avec l'approbation de Mgr. l'Evêque de Belley. Par l'Abbé Alfred Monnin, Missionnaire. 2 Vols. Paris: Douniol. 1861.</p> <p>Life of the Curé d'Ars. From the French of the Abbé Alfred Monnin. Second edition. London: Burns & Lambert. 1863.</p>	
III. PRISON MINISTERS ACT	356
<p>An Act for the Amendment of the Law relating to the Religious Instruction of Prisoners in County and Borough Prisons in England and Scotland. London: Printed by George Edward Eyre & William Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty. 1863.</p>	
IV. THE NEWLY DISCOVERED JEWISH CATACOMB AT ROME	397
<p>Cimitero degli Antichi Ebrei, scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini. Illustrato per Raffaele Garrucci, D.C.D.G. Roma: Coi Tipi della Civiltà Cattolica. 1862.</p> <p>Vetri Ornati di Figure in Oro, trovati nei Cimiteri dei Cristiani Primitivi di Roma. Raccolti e spiegati da Raffaele Garrucci, D.C.D.G. Roma: Salvucci. 1858.</p> <p>Letters from Rome to Friends in England. By the Rev. John W. Burgon, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London: Murray. 1862.</p>	
V. THE LETTERS OF S. TERESA.....	419
<p>Lettres de Sainte Térèse, traduites suivant l'ordre chronologique. Edition enrichie de lettres inédites, de notes, et de biographies, par le P. Marcel Bouix, de la Compagnie de Jésus. 3 tom. Paris: Lecoffre et Cie.</p>	

ART.	PAGE
VI. THE DOGMATIC PRINCIPLE.....	458
<p>Undogmatic Christianity. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, May 3, 1863, by the Rev. Walter Waddington Shirley, M.A. London and Oxford : Parker.</p> <p>The Unity of Evangelical and Apostolical Teaching. Sermons preached mostly in Canterbury Cathedral. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. London : Murray. 1859.</p>	
VII. THE CATHOLIC CONGRESS OF MALINES	482
<p>Assemblée Générale des Catholiques en Belgique. Première Session à Malines, 18—22 Aout, 1863. Programme des Travaux—Questions—Projets de Solution—Propositions. Bruxelles : Imprimerie de Th. Lesigne.</p>	
<i>Essays and Miscellaneous Papers.</i>	
VIII. HISTORICAL NOTES OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.....	494
<p>Part. II.—Tract 90 : its Antecedents, Motives, Object, and immediate Results.</p>	
IX. NOTICES OF BOOKS	509
<p>Mgr. Manning's Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects—Tischendorf's Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum—Valroger's Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres du Nouveau Testament—Schwane's Dogmengeschichte der vorincänischen Zeit—Madden's Galileo and the Inquisition—Lyell and Poole on the Antiquity of Man—Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church—Sighart's Albert le Grand—Mathieu's Livre de Prières—Cartier's Vie de Fra Angelico—Cartier's Dialogue et Lettres de S. Catharine de Sienne—Bouix's Œuvres Spirituelles de S. Pierre d'Alcantara—Bouix's La Solitaire des Rochers—Sixth Report of Inspector appointed to visit Reformatory and Industrial Schools—Parkinson's Lecture on Education—Anderdon's Adventures of Owen Evans—Wood's Glimpses into Petland—Blot's Auxiliatrices du Purgatoire—Question des Sœurs de la Charité en Portugal.</p>	
X. FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE	568
<p>Études Religieuses, Historiques et Littéraires—Le Correspondant—La Civiltà Cattolica.</p>	
XI. FOREIGN EVENTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST	583
<p>Polish Insurrection—Fausti Trial—Procession of the Santissimo Salvatore—Neapolitan States—Piedmont and Italy.</p>	

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1863.

ART. I.—POPULAR DEVOTION IN SPAIN.

Historia Ecclesiastica de España. Por D. Vicente de la Fuente. 4 vols.
Barcelona : Libreria Religiosa. 1859.

NO man is sufficient for himself. He is, and must be, dependent upon others. Almighty God, who created him in this state of dependency, has written in his heart the law of mutual love; and His own divine lips have pronounced that the love of our neighbour is one with the love of God. Nations in like manner are dependent upon one another. The whole system of commerce, of trade and barter, carried on as it is with such wear and tear, such infinite risks of danger, bloodshed, rebellion, war, is founded upon the primary axiom that we are all dependent upon one another; that the whole world is but one family, the members of which minister to each other's wants. No member can be treated with contempt or despised, because it is useful to the body, and the hour may come which will both prove and make manifest its uses. Many consider it to be the glory of this nation that this law of dependency has received a wide practical development in that gigantic system of commerce with which, as with a net, we encircle the whole globe. They have no difficulty in admitting that we must knock at the doors of other nations and enter in, receiving for our daily use, from one cotton, or hemp, or silk; from another various precious timbers; from another rare and dainty meats; from another fruits; from another scents and spices; from another gold, silver, lead;—even distant seas have to contribute their coral and their pearl, as well as their strange living creatures, in order to supply the ever-increasing demands, to minister to the ever-growing dependency of one portion of the human family upon the rest. How often may we hear a portly and, to use that expression so characteristic of modern ideas, respectable-looking gentleman gravely asserting that *everything* can be got in London, in which comprehensive term he takes special care to inform us that he

includes all that is edible. With a sort of honest pride, a conscious dignity and self-respect, many an Englishman congratulates himself on the fact that there are no waters over which our ships do not sail, no ports from which they do not bring to England some commercial tribute; no nation can compare with ours in its fleet of merchantmen; no other country can present us with a tithe of the appliances and means of comfort and luxury that we enjoy; the energy of our race not only has discovered but has appropriated to itself more varied and fruitful sources of wealth than are possessed by any other people on the face of the globe.

Without disputing the truth of all this, what, we would ask, is the principle contained in these self-congratulatory assertions? In its ultimate analysis it is this,—that the greatest nation is the one which is the least satisfied with itself, and is the most dependent upon others. As Emerson declares that “the greatest man is the most indebted man,” so it may be affirmed of nations that the greatest is the most indebted. Indeed, this principle may be said to have reached its apogee when the system of free trade received the sanction of the British Legislature.

So much, then, for the fact that England’s material greatness is due to the persevering energy and determination with which she has naturalized, and we may say Anglicized, the wealth and resources of foreign countries. We have thought it no derogation to our national dignity to become receivers and learners, rejecting nothing that might increase our material prosperity. And here the question suggests itself, how far have we carried out this principle in the higher order of morality? What have we borrowed from other nations? In what measure have we been anxious to advance our people in the moral scale, by introducing among them the thoughts, feelings, practices, and habits of other nations, where these are manifestly higher in tone and more in accordance with the spirit of Christianity than our own? Have we been as zealous to learn how we may raise our labouring poor from a condition more nearly resembling that of beasts of burden than of a Christian population? Where is the joy and sweetness of life, the intelligence in spiritual things, the ready, facile charity, the real refinement which we find among the peasantry of Catholic countries? In truth, it must be confessed that we have adopted the principle of free trade in commerce, but have ignored it as respects that interchange of moral influences by which nations can confer on each other the most solid benefits. In the pursuit of material prosperity we have run all over the world, but in all that affects the spiritual interests of our people

we have shut ourselves up within ourselves, and have treated other countries with absolute contempt. The cause of this, no doubt, may be found partly in that vein of pride and haughtiness which the English character has derived from its Norman admixture ; but much more in the nature of Protestantism, which persists in adhering to its one article of faith—its own sufficiency, while its people are sinking into the lowest depths of immorality and crime.

That the separation from the unity of the Church has been the chief cause of the peculiarity to which we have adverted, is evident from the fact that the same reproach cannot with equal justice be addressed to the Catholics of this country. If, from our common national character, we have been slow to learn and adopt the practices of others, and to copy whatever was worthy of imitation in their pious institutions, our religion, at all events, has helped us over this stumbling-block, and we have successfully naturalized much that once was foreign to us. We have crossed the Channel, and have done something towards supplying the faults and deficiencies in our workhouse system, for we have scarcely a town without its society of S. Vincent de Paul, whose members unite to the relief of corporal necessities that gentle kindness and love for their suffering brethren with which our holy religion inspires them. And now, of late, the *Petites Sœurs*—Little Sisters of the Poor—another French institution, have been introduced into our great towns, so that the old and destitute may receive from the generous and devoted hearts of women, who have consecrated themselves to God and to His poor, a sympathy and a tenderness which perhaps they have never known before. Then, too, we have out-door Nursing-Sisters and Hospital-Sisters, and other communities and works of foreign origin which it is not necessary to designate by name.

The fact is, if we have an earnest desire that the English people should one day exhibit the religious devotedness and sanctity for which the land had become famous before the Norman set foot upon its shores, we must in every way guard ourselves against a development of the nationalism, pride, and ambition which were the characteristics of that arrogant and overbearing race. To these qualities in the dominant class the contests about investiture, the hatred of the stranger, the trampling upon ecclesiastical rights, the suspicion and jealousy of Rome, the perpetual encroachments for 500 years of the State upon the Church, must be attributed. The Reformation, when it came, was but the legitimate growth, the fully ripened fruit, of those evil seeds which had been germinating for centuries. True greatness in religion was incompatible with

the *natural* development of the Norman character. The Church succumbed under it, and was wellnigh trodden out of the land. If it has sprung up again, it may be rather compared to the young underwood that succeeds the fallen forest. While tender and pliant and full of hope, it cannot be expected to yield the variety of beauty, the light and shade, the protection and retreat, afforded by the ancient trees, whose roots had ramified for ages in the soil below, and whose branching arms had twisted and intertwined themselves above in every form of mutual complication and embrace.

As England in the natural and material order may be considered as it were the focus of the commercial activity of the world, so is Rome in the supernatural and spiritual order the great religious mart and the centre of intercommunion and exchange. Herself absolutely supreme in authority, and infallible in her teaching, she rejects nothing that is good, from whatever quarter it may emanate. To her nothing that is praiseworthy, or honourable, or of good report, is foreign. Without envy she receives and learns of all, and without jealousy she gives and communicates to all. Her College of Cardinals admits natives of every country and clime. We can hardly realize her form and spirit until we have made ourselves acquainted with her great religious orders and communities—the Franciscan, the Dominican, the Jesuit, the Theatine, the Redemptorist, and others; yet the Jesuit and Dominican came from Spain, the Franciscan from Umbria, the Theatine and Redemptorist from Naples. And many of the most popular devotions and practices, such as the Quarant' Ore, Via Crucis, Missions, Retreats, devotion to the Sacred Heart, to S. Joseph, the Angelus, and many more, which have become as much identified with Rome as the very monuments out of which she is built,—these were not born to her, but were adopted and appropriated by her: *omnes isti congregati sunt, venerunt tibi*. Like Solomon, she has “made a market in all the kingdoms of the earth.” This generous largeness, this willingness to be recipient, and to adopt whatever is good, without regard to the whisperings of a petty national pride or a dread of foreign innovation, as it has its primal seat in the central heart of Christendom, so may it be regarded as the measure of the truly Catholic spirit in every portion of the Church; and it appears to us that nothing can be more desirable for the nascent Church in England, after joining together so closely and intricately the bonds which unite her to Rome that nothing shall ever again be able to dissolve them, than to imitate the example of the Mother and Mistress of Churches, and profit to the greatest possible extent by the experience of other countries: “*The wise*

man shall pass into strange countries, for he shall try good and evil among men." (Ecclus. xxxix. 5.)

To contribute in our measure towards an end intrinsically so desirable, we propose, as occasion serves, to lay before our readers some details of the religious practices and habits of Catholic lands. Not that we would seek to naturalize in England the peculiar customs of any foreign country, beautiful and admirable as they may appear in our eyes. We are far from meaning that any nation should destroy or dwarf its natural character in order to adopt that of some other; and we are equally far from asserting that the character of every, or indeed of any, other nation is superior to our own. Our point is simply this,—that all nations have their special good qualities, and that all may learn of one another, as in the physical so in the moral order. Further, we would contend that those nations into which the Catholic religion has most deeply penetrated, moulding and fashioning throughout the spirit, habits, and inner life of the people, are those very nations from which we in England have most to learn; and that we should do well to go to them in the spirit of learners. The more eagerly one portion—or rather, we might say, the bulk—of the community is hurrying to the pursuit of material and secular objects, the more earnest heed would we have the Catholic portion give to whatever in the religious practices of other countries may minister to our supernatural needs and add to our spiritual wealth.

Of all the Catholic countries of Europe we may confidently say that Spain is that upon which the Catholic religion has made the most indelible impression. There have been special causes for this, into which, however, it is not our present purpose to enter. We will only briefly remark, first, that for the eight centuries during which Spain contended with Moorish domination on her soil, and conquered it back inch by inch from her Mahometan oppressors, her people were naturally led to throw themselves into the arms of religion with all the fervour of men suffering for justice sake. The wars with the Moors were holy wars, and within the breast of every Spaniard there burned perpetually the spirit of a soldier of the Cross. The impress thus received by the Spanish nation during the long process of its formation, continued to mould and master it in its days of internal peace and prosperity, and wrought itself into all the minutest details of its life and habits. And here, secondly, the geographical position of Spain lent its aid to the perpetuation of the impression which the national character had once received and to the traditional preservation of its local customs. For all practical purposes an island—for the Pyrenees cut it off

from France almost as effectually as the Mediterranean from Africa—its people possessed whatever advantages local isolation affords: they were thrown more upon themselves, and were less subject to those external influences which affected countries like France and Germany, the great high-roads of Europe. To this result the peculiar configuration of the land largely contributed, intersected as it was with vast sierras, huge mountain chains possessing difficult means of transit and little to attract the stranger, the solitude of whose upland valleys favoured the establishment of numerous convents, round which clustered a hardy people of simple manners, in whom the spirit of piety was nurtured by their monastic teachers. And then, lastly, we should add that the character of the people naturally lent itself, as a good ground, to the cultivation of the spiritual life. Though the Spanish Government was at times even in arms against Rome, though regalism in different reigns reached an alarming height, and Voltaireanism in its day infected the higher orders, yet the mass of the people were never much affected by the vices of the distant court, of which, as of the infidel doctrines afloat amongst the educated classes, they remained for the most part profoundly ignorant. Habitually ruled by that religion which was everywhere present with them, it was only when the sovereign was true to his faith, obeying its holy impulses instead of being the slave of his passions, that his influence, now in harmony with that which swayed the heart of the people, was felt throughout every village in the land. For it was then seconded and supported by the monks, whose lives were devoted to the service of God, and whose one idea was the establishment of His kingdom in the hearts of men.

These, then, briefly, seem to have been the chief means by which the purity and fervour of faith were maintained in the Catholic heart of Spain, in spite of the corruption of courts and the poison of infidel and revolutionary doctrines. When, however, we call to mind the deleterious influences to which the country has been subjected for more than half a century, we need not wonder should we find that much of the old simple piety has departed. Our desire is to collect a few of the flowers which survive the hurricane, so that in some small way we may gather for ourselves, if not actual specimens to transplant, at least some portion of their sweet fragrance wherewith to refresh and regale our languishing piety. We may imbibe something of the spirit where we cannot copy the form. Should any of our readers desire to make himself more fully acquainted with the particular devotional practices and the religious condition of Spain during past centuries, we would refer him to the "*Historia Ecclesiastica de España*," by

D. Vicente de la Fuente : for ourselves, we do but offer a few notes upon Spain as it may be seen to-day.

First of all we will conduct our readers through the narrow, ill-paved streets of some Spanish town—that of Seville for instance. Men, women, and children, in driblets, are going in and coming out of a church close by. Let us go in also. It is the early morning, and masses are being said at several altars. The church appears almost dark within,—the light was so bright and clear outside, with the already risen sun and cloudless sky. The blinds are drawn down over all the windows in the clerestory ; and it is but very rarely that a Spanish church has any other windows. They do not like the light to come in from openings lower down, according to the English Gothic plan. Windows within a few feet of the ground would offend their eye and distract their minds, besides occupying valuable space for side chapels, statues, and pictures. Moreover, they have more than enough light from above, so they diminish and soften it down with curtains. The whole body of the church is full of people—the women seated on the ground or kneeling (there are no chairs or benches), the men standing or kneeling. And the women are all dressed in black, and wear black mantillas or veils upon their heads ; so that a lady appearing in a coloured dress would be altogether out of place, and attract attention by her singularity. The fashion in the church of God here is modesty, simplicity, and gravity of colour. The idea is that we go to church to appear before God as sinners, penitents, and suppliants—as children passing through a valley of tears ; and to come decked out in the plumage of birds of paradise would be shocking to the Spanish mind, and out of harmony with the thought that we are the fallen children of Adam. And such a practice is in strict accordance with that regulation prescribed by the Supreme Pontiff in Rome, who requires, at least when he is present, that women should appear in the church in grave and simple black. Protestantism has no sense or instincts with which to appreciate the meaning and fitness of such a rule, and its adherents have accordingly set a fashion in dress which is as elaborate and brilliant for the church as for a promenade ; and how contagious fashion is, we all can say. One marked advantage of this Catholic practice is that the poor are not shamed away on account of their soiled or tattered clothes. The excuse of not having clothes good enough to go to church in is not known in Spain.

Let us cast our eyes up the church, and what do we behold ? Here is a lady of wealth and rank, who has come from her palace hard by, and she is kneeling, their skirts touching one another, close to the poor woman who, as is her wont, has

just snatched half an hour from her daily work to come and hear mass. To the casual observer there is, externally, but little difference between them. The lady may have on a mantilla and a dress that is spotless, whereas her neighbour has perhaps a cotton handkerchief tied over her head, and a skirt that once was clean and black, but now from long wear is soiled and rusty; but this is all. They both have their beads in their hands, and both are telling them; and they join in the mass together, sitting, and kneeling, and striking their breast, and crossing themselves with the priest. They fit admirably well together: there is no incongruity; and even the poor beggar-girl close by, kneeling near the high altar, and surrounded by what in England are called her "betters," ladies by education and position, evidently has no idea that her proper place is at the bottom of the church, and that a due sense of decorum ought to have kept her from venturing on such close proximity to persons from whom she craves an alms in the street as they pass by. No, the church, with all its beauty and splendour of gilded carving, *churrigueresque** though it be, and its pictures, and its painted statues, decked out in velvet and silk, and gold and silver, belongs to the poor beggar-girl, and she feels and knows that it does, just as much as to the marquesa who presented the high altar with the six superb gold candlesticks that stand upon it. The church throughout Spain, as in every truly Catholic country, is the home of the poor. As our dear Lord during life chose to dwell among the poor, so the poor now feel that they have the privilege to go in and out of His house, and to be *close to Him*, and that nobody, even silently, can question their right.

We have not been in the church half-an-hour before our English ear is assailed by the cries and wailings of a child. Almost instinctively we turn round, and expect to see a respectable beadle rising to the height of his dignity, and about to perform part of the acknowledged duty of that functionary by marching both mother and child out of the sacred precincts. But not at all; and we feel an interior reproach in perceiving that we alone have been distracted by the noise. The mother had wished to hear mass, and she had no one with whom to leave her poor peevish child; so, of course, she brought it with

* Architecture succumbed under the influence of Churriguera, whose name, like that of a heresiarch, has become synonymous in Spain with his doctrine, and with all that is false and vile in taste: thus, *el Churriguerismo*, *Churrigueresco*, is used in the sense of *Rococo*. . . . There is scarcely a village in Spain whose parish church has escaped the harpy touch of this fatal epoch.—*Ford*.

her to church, without fear of a public expulsion, or so much as a harsh word or a reproachful look. It is the custom of the country: each respects the other's right to hear mass; and those little trials and annoyances which are inseparable from poverty and the presence of the poor are borne cheerfully and naturally as matters of course. Nay, habit has so familiarized the Catholic worshipper to such distractions, that they cease to be distractions, and are no more disturbing than the sounds and the noises which penetrate into our churches from our teeming London streets, and which we scarcely hear because we have become accustomed to them.

Here and there, too, may be observed a woman engaged with a child. At one time she looks affectionately into his face—a little boy, perhaps, of five years old,—and at another her eyes are earnestly directed towards the altar; while her arms are partly folded round him, as she holds his little hands. What is she doing? She is teaching him the meaning of the Holy Sacrifice, as the great act proceeds; and she is helping him to pray. How could the mother be better employed? In what way could the dawning intelligence and attention of a child, restless as the little birds that are for ever flitting from bough to bough and from twig to twig, be more gently and gladly constrained to esteem and take part in the most sacred of our sacred mysteries? When the child grows to be a man, we are not surprised to find him walking straight into the sacristy of a morning, to see if there be a mass to serve. And in Spain, even in these degenerate days, there are more men to be found, persons of education and often of noble birth, who esteem it a privilege to serve, or, as they say, "*ayudar*"—i.e., to help—the mass of some poor, ill-clad priest, than in any other country in the world; indeed, the rule is that every Spaniard knows how to serve mass.

There is throughout Spain the greatest reverence for the Holy Sacrifice, which at the altar shows itself by the use of two corporals, one laid out upon the other, and of two palls, one of which is used only from the Offertory to the Communion, and is then folded up in the corporals. At the Elevation a third candle is always lighted by the server, and placed upon the altar, there to remain as long as the sacred species remain; and in the great patriarchal church in Valencia a sacristan appears with a thurible, even in low mass, in order to honour with incense the Real Presence of our Lord. Among the people generally, reverence is shown by the careful way in which they follow the parts of the mass, while they say their rosary—for the rosary is the "golden manual" of Spain,—or sometimes use a book; a by the numbers of the poor and middle

classes, as well as of the educated, who hear a daily mass. They say, "Misa y cebada no estorban jornada" ("To hear your mass, and to feed your horse, stop no day's journey"). We not long ago travelled through a part of Catalonia, the Lancashire of Spain, the great manufacturing district and the most industrious portion of the Peninsula. It was the feast of S. Matthias, a day on which there is a precept to hear mass, though servile work is allowed. At twelve o'clock we observed streaming out of the factories towards the parish church of Monistral about 800 men and women. It was their dinner-time, and the hour to rest from work ; and they were all going, as a matter of course, to hear their mass of obligation. We fear there is not the same fervour everywhere among masters or workmen ; but in every town and in many populous villages there is a confraternity of men who, on all days when to hear mass is a precept, rise long before the sun, and at three o'clock A.M. are walking the streets in procession, singing the rosary to the ringing of a hand-bell ; and then about five o'clock the bell goes round through all the streets again, summoning all the labouring people to mass ; and though the church may be almost dark when the Holy Sacrifice begins, you will constantly find it full of the silent, hardy worshippers. The Blessed Sacrament is commonly called "Su Magestad" (His Majesty). You pay a visit to *His Majesty*, and handbills on the wall announce that a function will take place, &c., "in the presence of His Most August Majesty, in the Blessed Sacrament of our Altars." The sovereign of the country, if she meets the Most Holy in the streets being borne to the sick or dying, alights from her carriage, and gives it up to the priest who bears It ; thus resigning her royal honours to the King of kings, that she may follow in His train on foot, like the humblest of her subjects. So truly has this devotion become an integral portion of the religious life of the nation. The prayer which is known and said by every Spaniard who prays at all, which is taught him as a child, and is the beginning of every private prayer, and is recited in the pulpit before every sermon, is called "El Bendito," and runs thus : "Blessed and praised for ever be the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar, and the Immaculate Conception of the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our Lady, conceived without stain of original sin in the first instant of her most pure being. Amen." And the Spanish catechism, answering the question "Where is Jesus Christ?" tells the child, "In Heaven, and in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar." One portion of the doctrine comes home to him from infancy as naturally and familiarly as the other.

Nowhere in Europe is the Blessed Sacrament so frequently exposed in the church for veneration. Every town of any importance has its Jubilé Circular—that is, its *Quarant' Ore*—all the year round, moving every three days from church to church. And in order to be able to carry on the devotion all through the year without pressing too heavily on towns where the churches are in smaller number, the Holy See has granted permission that the Blessed Sacrament should be taken down at night, and that the term of forty hours should be completed during three consecutive days. The advantage of this is very great. The devotion of the people is provided for, the churches are not too heavily taxed, the difficulty of night watching, which is a considerable charge in a small town all the year round, is obviated, the indulgences are equally applicable, and places which otherwise could not enjoy the privilege are blessed with the presence of our Lord seated on His sacramental throne to receive the homage of the inhabitants, listen to their requests, and bestow His favours.

Nor must we omit to mention the extraordinary processions which take place throughout Spain on the feast of Corpus Christi. All the figures of the old law typical of the Blessed Sacrament appear in these processions: an old man is dressed up as Melchisedec, bearing bread and wine; others carry between them, on a pole, two heavy bunches of grapes; then follows the paschal lamb, with other mystical symbols; to which succeed enormous giants, representing, in traditional costumes, the four quarters of the world, confessing and adoring the Great Mystery of the Altar; while boys and youths, attired in the garb of people of every race and colour, and armed with their national weapons, surround the Blessed Sacrament, showing how all nations and tribes should unite together to defend and do homage to our Divine Lord, hidden under the lowly species; and as David danced before the Ark when carried in procession, so they modestly dance before the Blessed Sacrament as It is triumphantly borne along. Little books, explanatory of it all, are sold by the poor and the blind. Children eagerly ask their mothers the meaning of these various figures; the poor gaze, year by year, upon many of the most beautiful types of the Old Testament; and so all learn without effort, and their devotion kindles as they learn. In Valencia this ceremonial is especially striking; but every town and village has its procession of Corpus Christi, marked by some peculiar illustration of the popular devotion.

The national reverence for the Blessed Sacrament naturally develops itself in a corresponding respect for priests, who are Its ministers. Thus, in the streets, not only gentlemen, but

even ladies, will step off the narrow side-pavement to allow a priest to pass; nor would even a high-born dame be at all pleased if a priest, poor and humble as he might be, offered to give her the precedence and make way for her. Such is the reverence shown to the sacred character, which poverty and lowliness, so far from obscuring, often only serve to bring out into stronger relief. So, too, the custom prevails throughout the country of kissing the priest's hands—those hands that are daily sanctified by holding the Body and Blood of Christ, and from which are continually proceeding blessings in His name. The children in the streets will stop any priest they see passing along, calling out to him "*La mano, la mano*" ("the hand, the hand")—not "*your hand*," but "*the hand*," the hand which has been anointed and is a holy thing. And then they kiss it, and if the priest blesses them, they say "*Amen*." To pass by a school that is breaking up is really a serious consideration for a priest who is in a hurry, for he is besieged on all sides with cries of "*La mano*," and this in a country where a priest is not, as in England, a *rara avis*, but where now, as for centuries, he may be met with at every turn. As a further illustration of the national respect for the sacerdotal character, it may be added that every private soldier salutes a priest as though he were one of his recognized superiors, whom he looks up to and reveres. In England it has often been questioned whether a secular priest should be called father in virtue of his priestly office. In Spain, as in Catholic Ireland, the custom among the people is to look upon the priest as a father, whether he be a secular or a religious; and the people commonly speak of him as "*Padre Cura*" ("Father Rector"), or by whatever other office he may hold among them. So Cardinal Borromeo thought he was only returning to the just and primitive practice, and to that of the Roman ritual, when he decreed that the Oblates of Milan, though simple secular priests, should be called by no other title than that of father.

There is throughout Spain a great devotion to the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. Whatever name a child receives in baptism, there is usually added to it that of the Holy Trinity. The form runs thus, for instance—Joseph, Mary, OF THE MOST HOLY TRINITY, I baptize thee, &c. Sometimes the name of the Blessed Sacrament is added. The Trisagium, a prayer known by everybody, and commonly recited in the evening after the rosary, is taught to children from their earliest years. It is in constant use, and runs thus:—

Blessed and praised be the Most Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts. Full are the heavens and

earth of the majesty of Thy glory. Glory to the Father, glory to the Son, glory to the Holy Ghost. To which is often added :—

I believe in the Most Holy Trinity ;
I hope in the Most Holy Trinity ;
I love the Most Holy Trinity ; -
I am sorry for having offended the Most Holy Trinity ;
I desire to see the Most Holy Trinity. Amen.

This devotion to the highest of all mysteries, which the religious Protestant mind so often shrinks even from considering, is so dear to the Spanish heart, that it seeks an outward expression in pictures and statues, which we see continually in private houses, churches, and even in the highways : for instance, in the midst of the great broad road by the Guadalquivir, in Seville, stands a magnificent pile representing the Blessed Trinity, erected at the public expense as an act of devotion.

It has been supposed by some, and is so set down by Mr. Ford in his " Handbook," that not only is Mariolatry supreme in Spain, but that " the Almighty is robbed of his prerogative, and his sceptre rendered barren, to the exclusion and derogation of the ' only one name and none other ' " (p. 913 and *passim*). We will not stop to notice further, much less to refute, a work which disgusts even many a Protestant traveller. We cannot, however, refrain from expressing our regret that an author who to the qualifications of good scholarship has added the merit of considerable reading and research, should not have adhered more faithfully to the authorities on which he has professedly rested his statements, and still more that he should not only have disfigured his pages with an unworthy display of conceit and affectation, but have sacrificed truth and delicacy to the gratification of a stupid prejudice, and even to the more effective turn of a sentence, to a degree we have never seen equalled in any similar publication. The only refutation we will offer of the vulgar charge brought against the popular devotions of Spain shall be of the simplest practical kind. We will tell how the Spaniard celebrates that which is to him, as it is to all Catholics, the most solemn and sacred time of the year—Passiontide, and the Lent which precedes it. And here it is not out of place to note that the hours of the sermons and services, which take place daily during Lent in every church of any pretensions, together with the names of the preachers (as indeed is the practice throughout the year), are advertised in all the daily and weekly newspapers. So closely

does religion enter into the calculations and habitual life of the people, that they require this information even of the notoriously uncatholic journals, whose editors, so far from making a charge for insertion, employ and pay a person for collecting all such ecclesiastical details. The system of advertising every religious function has sprung out of the wants and claims of the people; and rightly has the Church availed herself of so simple a means for keeping the blessings of which she is the dispenser constantly before the eyes of her children, even in cafés, and inns, and places of public resort.

One of the most favourite devotions is that to the Holy Family, and it manifests itself most naturally during the season of which we are speaking. The feast of S. Joseph, or, as they commonly call him, "the Patriarch," almost always occurring in Lent, the usual series of sermons is interrupted by a seven or nine days' celebration in his honour. It were difficult to convey an idea of the fervour displayed by all good Catholics: the devotion becomes a sort of mission, at which crowds attend. In Seville it took place, at one and the same time, in no less than twenty-nine different churches. The feast of S. Joseph over, the Novena, or Septena, of his immaculate spouse, our Lady of Dolours, shortly afterwards begins. Our blessed Lady is honoured in Spain under the title of her Dolours more, perhaps, than under any other, unless it be that of her Immaculate Conception. It is a mystery of so practical a character, it is so often brought home to the heart of each one of us during this our mortal pilgrimage, and it is so closely and intimately connected with the sufferings of God Incarnate, that the theological mind of Spain has seized upon it with an especial affection. This is the great preparation for Passiontide: it becomes the occasion of another mission; and by an almost imperceptible transition the soul passes to the contemplation of the mysteries of the Passion, having been led on its way thereto by Joseph and by Mary.

The Roman ritual is followed in Spain as it is with us, and consequently there is little that is peculiar to the country in the regular liturgical services. On Palm Sunday issue forth the first processions of the *cofradías*; and so important a place do they occupy, that we must make an exception in their favour, and speak of them at somewhat greater length.

One of the most instructive and striking features in the religious institutions of Spain is the number of her confraternities, or brotherhoods. There is no country in the world so rich in these associations: in the past it was even richer; but they are still wonderfully numerous. Every kind of work of charity is undertaken by a confraternity, from the visiting of

the poor to the burying of the dead. The Society of S. Vincent de Paul is not only established, but, being well supplied with members, does its work efficiently in all the large towns; and many of the small and comparatively unimportant places in the interior of the country have their branch association. But what we now wish to call attention to is the number of confraternities that have for their object simply spiritual and devotional practices. Of these the confraternities that take part in the functions of Holy Week are the most conspicuous. The "*Historia Critica y Descriptiva de las Cofradias fundadas en la Ciudad de Sevilla*," por D. Felix Gonzalez de Leon (Sevilla, 1852), tells us that these confraternities date their origin from the fourteenth century, and that the first in Seville was that of *Santo Cristo della Fundacion y Maria Santisima de los Angeles*. The slave-trade was at that time being carried on upon a large scale, and Seville was one of the chief seats of the traders. The poor negroes were accustomed to obtain permission of their masters to unite together on Good Friday and at other times for religious exercises; they made processions and performed various acts of devotion. The archbishop of the day, Don Gonzalo de Mena, interested himself actively in the association, gave the negroes a chapel, and in various ways encouraged their zeal and piety. Others imitated the good example, and various confraternities were formed. Some wished to pay special honour to some particular mystery of the Passion, as the Prayer in the Garden; others the Condemnation, others again the *Ecce Homo*, and others the Crucifixion or Burial of our Lord; and thus, in course of time, as many different confraternities were formed as there were portions of the Passion which it was specially designed to honour. The mode in which they sought to testify their devotion to the mysteries under which they had enrolled themselves was by prayers and penances. In this manner they strove to realize in themselves the sufferings of our Lord, and to follow Him in His Passion; bearing with them through the streets pictures of our Redeemer, and carrying torches and lighted tapers in their hands. S. Vincent Ferrer, that apostle of the fifteenth century, visited and preached in Seville in 1408, and through his exhortations many of the confraternities adopted the public use of the discipline: hence, these brotherhoods became known by the names of *Cofradias de Penitencia, Sangre, y Luz*—Confraternities of Penance, Blood, and Light.

Each *cofradia* has its fixed day and hour for leaving its church in procession for a visit to the cathedral during Holy Week. The book before us gives a detailed account of no less than forty-one such confraternities in Seville alone.

They are distinguished by such names as the following, in addition to those already specified: "the Entry into Jerusalem," "the Last Supper," "Christ's Leave-taking of His Mother," "the Scourging at the Pillar," "Christ looking on Peter," "the Silence of Christ," "His Coronation," "His three Falls under the Cross," "the Seven Words," "the Conversion of the Penitent Thief," "the Solitude of Mary," &c. The mysteries which give their names to the confraternities are represented in statues dressed in rich robes according to the wealth of the members, and of a size larger than life. They are placed securely on a splendid platform, surrounded with tapers and lamps, and are thus borne slowly along to the cathedral upon the shoulders of some thirty men, and from the cathedral by another route to the church from which they issued. Moreover, each confraternity once during the year keeps with becoming splendour the feast-day of its mystery.

By degrees these confraternities grew in importance: they took the shape of regularly organized corporations under the jurisdiction of the archbishop, and even became the subject of synodical action. From time to time the civil authorities interfered, and on various occasions bore heavily upon them; abuses, too, arose, and there were litigations and feuds about precedency. At the present day many have lost the simplicity and spirit of penance with which they first began, and have manifested a certain tendency to luxury and pomp, which, however, confines itself for the most part to the magnificent images they carry in procession, which are covered with silver and gold and precious stones. But there are others which have retained their primitive austerity, and are composed of priests, as well as of many of the gentry. Some such as these are in almost every large town, and we shall have more to say about them when we come to speak of the Good Friday ceremonies.

Now, what is the effect which the sight of these processions carrying their *pasos* is calculated to produce upon the minds of the population? The effect must be immense. First, they are a public recognition in all the great thoroughfares of the land of the sufferings of Christ, and of their having been endured for us. The realities of our religion are brought home to every passer-by, be he denizen or stranger. They give a public character to the whole awful drama of Holy Week, and stamp the sacred events that are being commemorated on the popular mind. Secondly, the various parts of our Blessed Saviour's Passion are taught to children, the poor, and the ignorant, with an accuracy and a vividness which no book, no sermon, or oral instruction could give. A personal love for our Lord is inspired and fostered, as each beholder is drawn to the

consideration of that portion of the Passion which moves him most. The whole population is gathered together to watch the processions pass, and if they are not as grave and silent and solemn under an Andalusian sun as our northerns would be, it must be remembered that they are not the natives of a cold northern clime, and that they worship God none the less devoutly because the temperament of their mind is bright and cheerful rather than sad and sombre. We may observe, however, that we never remember to have seen such perfect order and decorum in any English crowd as in the concourse of the whole Sevillian population to witness the processions of the confraternities of Holy Week.

It is on Palm Sunday that the first processions go forth, but nothing remarkable takes place till the rending of the veil in the cathedral on Wednesday in Holy Week. On Maundy Thursday the Blessed Sacrament is reserved with an unusual splendour. In England an idea has prevailed, which no doubt came over from France, that this reservation during the day and night of Thursday is a commemoration of our Lord's entombment by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus. Indeed, we remember not unfrequently to have seen transparencies and pictures of our Lord in the tomb (forbidden though they are by the Congregation of Rites) under the altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is placed. To say nothing of the anachronism which such representations imply, the true idea is brought out in the most unmistakeable and striking manner in every church in Spain, both by priests and people.

It is the institution of the Holy Eucharist that is being celebrated,—far from the mind of everyone, therefore, the thought of constructing a tomb, however preciously decked with gold and silver, and blazing with lighted tapers. It must be a monument, a memorial, a commemoration, most sumptuous and glorious in its character, of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. And this is the form which that which we so often miscall the Sepulchre takes in every Spanish church. You see at once that the Blessed Sacrament is being treated, not with the sorrow and grief that befit a burial, but with the tender rejoicing of hearts that overflow with love and gratitude, and pour out, like Magdalen, their richest treasures to honour as best they can this Divine Gift and Giver. From early dawn on Maundy Thursday till Holy Saturday begins, not a cart or carriage or public conveyance moves through any of the streets of Spain; only the mails and diligences which traverse the country are allowed to perform their journeys. Maundy Thursday is a day on which the whole nation gratefully and lovingly rejoices. The people, after the

morning service, don their best attire, and all the women of the land, from the lady to the peasant, appear abroad in dresses of brilliant blue, and green, and red, and white, and pink, and violet, quite shocking to the taste of a Parisian, though English eyes are more accustomed to such kaleidoscopic combinations. Those who go to the church again in the evening return, of course, to their simple black; and on Good Friday the whole nation goes into mourning. Everybody appears in black; the shops are closed; the streets are silent and still.

At Seville, as early as two o'clock in the morning, the confraternity of Our Father Jesus of Nazareth issues forth from its church of S. Anthony in silence, and with bare feet, carrying torches and bearing along its magnificent *paso* to the cathedral, where its members visit our Lord in His splendid tabernacle, before the services of the day begin. From S. Laurence comes forth the confraternity of Our Father Jesus of Great Power, bearing a huge cross; and from S. Gil that of the Condemnation of Christ to death, and of Mary Most Holy, of Hope: these all proceed in silence and in prayer to the cathedral. During the day the soldiers march, or stand and keep guard, with their arms reversed; their drums are muffled, as when they mourn the death of some great commander; and it is touching to see them in the barrack square, when the rattle sounds all over the city from the cathedral tower, the Giralda, at twelve o'clock, doffing their forage-caps to say the Angelus,—for many are simple, faithful souls, who may be taken as fair specimens of the country parts from which they are recruited. In Madrid, when the sovereign goes up to adore the Cross, before she has made her third prostration, and kissed the sacred wounds of her Redeemer, an official interposes, and solicits the royal forgiveness for a certain number of prisoners who stand condemned to death. She responds aloud, in the hearing of all her court, that as she hopes God will forgive her her sins and remit the punishment due to them, so will she show mercy and remit the sentence of death which had been pronounced against these her subjects. On the last occasion, five criminals from different parts of the country thus received their pardon. The religious influence of such acts upon the nation was greater, no doubt, when the royal power was at its height, but even now the chord when struck still vibrates.

In the evening other *pasos* are carried in procession, and thus the public mind the whole day long is fixed upon the scenes that were enacted in Jerusalem on the day of our redemption. Pilate receives his meed of hatred, the barbarous Roman soldiers are abused with foulest words, the Jews are

loudly execrated. Then, again, the boys in the streets dress up in yellow rags a vile effigy of Judas, and load him with the most opprobrious epithets; they will then shoot at him with an old musket, and at last kick and beat him to pieces, or hang him and cut him open.

The devotion of the Three Hours' Agony is one that has a great attraction for the people. In some places it is accompanied with a ceremonial which, strange as it might look to unaccustomed eyes, and irreverent and even profane as it might be thought by those who never witnessed it, is productive of a solemn and most powerful effect. The last portion of the Passion is represented in all its circumstances by living men: there are the Jews, the soldiers, and the thieves; and there is our Lord himself. He who personates our Blessed Redeemer hangs for three hours upon the cross, and during that time the priest preaches, with this spectacle before the people's eyes, upon the last seven words and the sufferings and death of Christ; upon the particular virtues to be practised, and the special vices to be avoided. And all this is done with a gravity and a modesty which no one, however prejudiced, could gainsay. The simple earnest faith of the people is profoundly touched: it is no mere sacred drama that is being performed for their instruction—it is the dread Reality itself that is being enacted then and there before them. Nothing is more surely calculated to impress the imagination of the religious Spaniard (and, we will add, of any devout Catholic), as, assuredly, nothing from year's end to year's end is brought more powerfully and more vividly before his mind and eye. And if God would have us use our senses so as to help us on to heaven, why should we not use them in the way which helps us most? Whatever, then, the coldhearted, intellectually refined, and censorious critic may say of these displays of religious feeling and affection, *Passiontide* to the Spaniard *is* *Passiontide*, and he realizes all its sorrows and mysteries every year anew—as they certainly do not whose one idea of Good Friday is hot-cross buns for children, and salt fish before the meat for those who are older; or a trip down the river in a penny steamboat; or a day at the Crystal Palace, to hear Mr. Spurgeon, and see the lions.

Holy Saturday is called, "*Sabato de Gloria*:" the nation quits its mourning, the carts and carriages again ply up and down the streets, youths cry out with joy, "No more Lent, no more fasting till next year!" In the afternoon a market is held in every town, and parents take their children to buy their Easter lamb.

Here we may be met with a question: Do all these externals

which touch the senses terminate there? or do they correspond to an interior life of piety? We answer with a distinction,—that here, as elsewhere, there is the more and the less; the earnest and devout, the tepid and indifferent. We have been assured, however, as a matter of fact, by persons in a position to know, and to be able to speak without partiality, that in Catalonia, perhaps the most devout as well as the most industrious province of the Peninsula, the mass of the people communicate, on an average, once a month; and that many are weekly and even daily communicants. A meditation is read in the churches at nightfall, and pauses are made for reflection between the several points; music is sometimes introduced; and a short instruction, or the recital of the rosary, concludes the public devotions. It is thus that the people are taught to meditate. Another practice, which is of great benefit, especially to the uneducated, is this. The priest reads from the pulpit prayers, in the vernacular tongue, in honour of some mystery of our Blessed Lord's life or that of our Lady, and the people repeat the words aloud, sentence by sentence, as he reads them. Anything might be taught the people in this way. It is adopting publicly in the church a practice which has been found to be a most efficient method of teaching in our poor schools, especially when an explanation follows the prayers, or precedes them.

The people are well provided with books of devotion. We have noticed in the country towns that stalls in the street contain scarcely any other books than prayer-books, the Following of Christ, the Devout Life, meditations, and lives of saints. It must be allowed that the Spanish are not a reading people as we are; and vast numbers of the poor and middle classes read little else than such works as we have specified. The *Libreria Religiosa*, founded in 1848 by Mgr. Claret, is, however, doing a great work, by providing cheap books of devotion and instruction, as well as Catholic literature generally. The books are sold at cost price. But no country is richer than Spain in old books of piety. The spiritual writers of the Spanish school in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were more numerous than those of Italy or France. There is very little original writing now: the people are satisfied with translations from foreign works, or new editions of their own authors, and the stray old parchment volumes that are to be found in every house.

Devotion to the Immaculate Mother of God, we need not say, is one of the chief characteristics of a country which calls itself with pride "*La tierra de Maria Santisima*." It is affirmed, indeed, that the people received the devotion from the Isidorian school of the seventh century; and it would be an interesting occupation to illustrate at length and in various

detail the earnestness and the enthusiasm they have ever displayed in asserting and defending the doctrine. The way in which the populace in Seville, more than three centuries ago, when grave theologians in the schools thought they discerned reasons for a contrary teaching, took up the cause of the Immaculate Conception, reminds us of the conduct of the Ephesians at the celebrated council of the fifth century. The honour of Mary was vindicated by them with more than the ardour and the prowess of knightly chivalry. The honour of Mary was more sacred, and more precious, and more personal to themselves than that of any other creature. To attack her Immaculate Conception was to wound a "*pundonor*." The whole Spanish nation and its possessions in America were in 1617 placed under the patronage of the Immaculate Conception; and from century to century the voice of Spain was heard clamouring unceasingly for the definition of the doctrine as an article of the faith. Nearly every cathedral in Spain is dedicated to the Blessed Virgin; and in churches in which there are many altars, it is not uncommon to find the greater number of them under her patronage, with statues or pictures above them representing the Immaculate Conception, the Dolours, Our Lady of Carmel, and other titles under which she is invoked. Thus in the church of Santa Maria del Mar, in Barcelona, there are not less than twenty side-chapels dedicated to her honour.

It is not surprising to find that with this great and universal devotion to our Lady, her name should be commonly adopted in baptism. And here is another national peculiarity: the people take her name coupled with that of a mystery, and are called ever afterwards by the mystery which was given them to honour. Thus, Maria de la Concepcion, Maria de la Encarnacion, Maria de la Rosario, Maria de los Dolores, are known respectively as Concepcion, Encarnacion, Rosario, Dolores. And next to this, the most common name is Josefa. Though men are not often called by the name of Mary, they generally have received it in baptism as a second or third name. And as a broad rule, you may say that every woman is Maria Josefa, and every man Jose Maria. The love of Mary has entered into the language of the people, and "Ave Maria purisima," to which the reply is "Sin pecado concebida," used to be as common a salutation as "Good day" or "How d'ye do" are in England. And even still it is in common use in the parts where modern ideas have not much penetrated. Everywhere it is a note of exclamation commoner than any other. Nor is this all. The rosary is *par excellence* the devotion of Spain. Everybody, rich or poor, aiming in any

measure at leading a good life, as a matter of course daily says his rosary. On feast-days it is often sung in the church as an evening devotion, and the mysteries are explained from the pulpit; and in every religious family the recital of the rosary, together with the "Bendito," to which we have already referred, forms part of the night prayers. Nor is our Lady's name and invocation confined to the daytime: in many towns, where the Liberal Government of the Revolution did not succeed in enforcing the order which was issued to stop it, the *sereno*, or watchman, in the street prefaces his announcement of the hour of the night and of the weather by the sweet words, "Ave Maria purisima," which he gives out in a plaintive tone. Thus they who in sickness or in trouble lie awake and listen for the passing hours are reminded that they also should raise their hearts to Heaven and say, "Ave Maria purisima!"

We could have wished to dwell upon the universal devotion which exists to S. Joseph. S. Teresa and Suarez succeeded in implanting it so deeply in the hearts of the people that there is not a church in the land without an image or altar of S. Joseph; his feasts are always kept with a Novena or Septena, and the 19th of March is a holiday of obligation. Thus the great devotion of the people may be said to be that to the Holy Family; and by the way we may observe that this devotion is much on the increase amongst ourselves. Nor is it essential either to its idea or its practice that our Lord should always be considered as an infant in the Holy House of Nazareth: as suffering in His Passion, or as hidden in the Blessed Eucharist, He may still be adored as the Child of Mary and Joseph, and as belonging to them by special ties. After this comes devotion to S. Joachim and S. Anne, as being the grandfather and grandmother of our Lord and the parents of our blessed Lady. Perhaps the Venerable Marina de Escobar may be looked upon as the apostle of the devotion to S. Joachim and S. Anne.

We must not omit a few words on the devotion of the Spaniards to the Holy Souls. The late learned and devout Dr. Windischmann, of Munich, was wont to say that a sure test of the Catholic spirit was devotion to our Lady and to the souls in Purgatory; and the Spanish nation bears testimony to the truth of the remark. The deep and fervent charity that burns in its heart not only embraces all the members of the Church on earth, but glows with a like intensity towards the souls of the departed. And so much has this love of the Spaniard for the suffering souls been encouraged by the Holy See, that every priest in Spain has the power of saying three masses on All Souls' Day—a privi-

lege possibly never sought, and certainly not enjoyed, by any other nation. Every year a Novena, which in Spain is equivalent to a mission, takes place in every church for the Holy Souls. It is usual to expose some picture of Purgatory, and the Blessed Virgin is represented above, aiding by her prayers the petitions of the faithful. So universal is this love and tenderness for the suffering souls, that a Protestant writer certainly spoke a Catholic truth, though couched in language of contemptuous scorn, when he said, "More money has been thus spent in masses than would have covered Spain with railroads, even on a British scale of magnificence and extravagance."

The Gospel tells us that love of the poor is a mark of a true Christian. Now, in Spain it may be said that, till a few years ago—that is to say, till the suppression of every monastery in the kingdom—pauperism was unknown. The poor had been so well loved, and were daily so well cared for, in town and country, by the convents, those homes of the people, that a beggar was rarely to be met with. Now all this gospel civilization has been swept away, and men—the men of the revolution—have thought to improve the world by closing all the religious houses and confiscating their property to the State. One of the results is that there is an increasing number of mendicants. But even still there remain abundant traces of the true Catholic spirit, which regards all men as brethren in Christ, and treats poor as well as rich with the respect which is due to the Christian character. It is not that there is no distinction of classes; on the contrary, rank and nobility have always been highly esteemed in Spain. But there is not that separation which prevails in England: there is none of that jealous spirit of isolation which leads men habitually to surround themselves with a cold and repelling atmosphere, as a defence against the too near approach of those whom they do not reckon to belong to their own standing in society. Then, again, that awful gap which separates the acknowledged inferior from his superior in this country is quite unknown in Spain, and indeed, we may say, in any really Catholic country. The Catholic spirit imparts a delicate sense of charity which makes a man sensitively alive to the claims that others have on his respect, prompting him to give honour to whom honour is due, and preserving the superior from arrogance and contempt, and the inferior from servility and flattery. In Spain this Christian habit has been rooted and strengthened by long years of uninterrupted Catholic training. They are a nation of nobles, even to the very beggars.

All, even the poorest, have an innate respect for one another, as they have for themselves. Thus, in speaking to any poor

person, you address him as "usted," or "your mercy," or "caballero;" and they address one another with the same self-restraint and respect. A rich proprietor was going on business to visit his orange-grove. We accompanied him, in order to regale our eyes with the glories of his golden harvest. We asked him a question. He called one of his day labourers to give the answer, and addressed him thus: "If you please, usted (your mercy), how many oranges do these trees bear?" "About four thousand each, your mercy," was the reply, in the very same tone of respect. We stopped to speak to the ploughman, who, with the old Moorish plough, was scratching up the soil among the tenderer plants in the orange-grove. As we left, the familiar expression of the servant to his master was, "Vaya V. con Dios" ("May your mercy depart with God"); to which the natural and beautiful reply was, "Quede V. con Dios" ("And may your mercy remain with God"). This is the usual and familiar expression throughout all classes in Spain. We have often been amused by observing with what ease and confidence a man of the lower classes will stop a gentleman in the road, be it his lordship or his grace, and ask for a light from his cigarette; for here even the beggar who sits at the corner of the street asking alms, manufactures and smokes his cigarette. Nor is the gentleman surprised or offended, but lends his cigarette "with all good grace to grace a gentleman."

This familiarity, these free and easy manners, are accompanied with no vulgarity, nor do they lead to any unbecoming intrusiveness; on the contrary, with admirable tact and delicacy, he who is inferior in station knows how far he may go, and never goes further. Of this we could furnish many instances, did our space permit. If you arrive in a town, and inquire the way to your hotel, or to the museum, or to the church, you will probably be accompanied by the person of whom you have made the inquiry. You beg him not to trouble himself. He assures you that it is a pleasure. You fear you are taking him out of his way. He tells you that it is his way: his way is to be kind and obliging. And if he be a poor man, and you offer him payment, he will be pained that you should suppose he expects remuneration for a simple act of courtesy; the most he would accept would be a cigarette, if you have any.

We have said that long years of Catholic training have imparted to the people a nobility and a mutual respect which does not exist in any country where the Catholic element has not equally prevailed. How touchingly is this exemplified in the way a Spaniard treats the poor mendicant to whom he

refuses an alms. "Brother," he calls him—"brother, for the love of God forgive me." At once he receives a bow, or hears a prayer whispered for him, as though the extended hand had obtained what it asked. To this very day, on the wall of the chief ward in the beautiful hospital of the Caridad, which is served and managed by a brotherhood composed of many of the best families of Seville, we see a list of "the hours at which dinner is served to *our masters and lords the poor*:" then follow the hours. This needs no comment: it speaks the natural feeling of a Catholic people, who regard poverty, not as a thing mean or vile, but as a state that commands respect and deference, a badge of distinction, a patent of high nobility in the kingdom of God. In this hospital none but priests and gentlemen serve the poor at their meals. We visited it in the company of a Spanish nobleman, a senator, and his family; and one of their first acts was to go and kiss reverently the hands of a poor, bed-ridden old man. Even Majesty itself delights to render this homage of Christian love; for when the queen of Spain visited the hospital last year, she went up at once to the old man who had been longest in the house, and respectfully kissed his hands.

The inscription over the door of the Hospital is so strikingly beautiful, and has in it withal so much of the grandeur, pathos, and tender reverence for the poor, characteristic of ancient Spanish piety, that we subjoin a literal rendering of it:—

This work was completed in the year of our salvation 1674—there reigning in heaven our Lord Jesus Christ—He being Supreme Pontiff of the Church, who is High Priest according to the order of Melchisedec—He reigning in the Spains who reigns in heaven—His Divine Majesty being elder brother of this House, and He who thunders in the heavens being a poor brother on these beds,—erected at the cost and expense of the Providence of the Most High God His Father, with whom He lives and reigns in the Unity of the Holy Spirit for ever and ever.*

We need hardly call our readers' attention to the way in which, instead of the reign of some earthly sovereign, we have the reign in Heaven of our Divine Lord, the Supreme Pontiff of the Church—who yet is the reigning monarch of Spain; and who, in the persons of His representatives the

* Esta obra se acabó año de nuestra Salud de 1674, imperando en el cielo, N.S.J.C., siendo sumo Pontifice de la Iglesia el que es Sumo Sacerdote segun el orden de Melchisedec, reynando en las Españas el que reyna en el cielo, siendo hermano mayor de esta casa Su Divina Magestad y pobre hermano en estas camas el que truena en el cielo—hicieronla a costa y espensas de la Providencia del Muy Alto Dios su Padre, con quien vive y reyna en unidad del Spiritu Santo mas alla de los siglos.

poor, is the elder brother of the house, and is tended, as a sick man, in its beds—"I was sick, and ye visited Me;" nor how, where in this country we should read, "Erected by voluntary contributions," we find the foundation of the institution referred to the Providence of the Most High God. "That Spain—the Spain of that spirit" (writes a Spanish friend in reference to the above inscription), "is so dear to my heart. There is so deep a mine of heroic love of God in our true Spaniards! They seem to feel that, however little we often do, and however great our shortcomings may be, no exuberance of expression, no excess of familiarity that is within the bounds of reverence, is too much in speaking of a God who is—not a great Mechanician, or a great Philosopher—but God that really is, and not a mere logical necessity. In reading that inscription, one feels that these Spaniards, who cannot think of representing our Lord excepting as covered with richest velvet, and gorgeous, yard-deep fringes of true gold, would detect Him at a glance, were He to appear on a sick bed in a hospital, in merest rags. And is not this the sum total of the conception of our Lord by the spiritual mind—to join the highest possible idea of Divine and human grandeur with the apprehension of the very lowest humiliation? After this, does it not follow that the Spaniards of that spirit must, naturally, realize an intense devotion to holy images, and to the Blessed Virgin, and to the Saints, and to the Blessed Sacrament, and to the mystery of the Adorable Trinity? One comprehends it all in a moment—it must so be."

While on this subject, we must not omit a further mention of that brotherhood of charity to which we have just alluded. We mean the *Cofradia de la Caridad*, whose one sole object is "the nursing of the sick by night," and whose very existence bespeaks a tender love of the poor. It may be seen working to perfection in the busy populous town of Barcelona—the Manchester of Spain, as Catalonia is its Lancashire; though the bright sky that overcanopies it, and the blue waters of the Mediterranean that lap its shores, and its cleanly streets and beauteous churches, are in strange and striking contrast with the smoky, murky, saddening Manchester with which we are familiar. Here in this busy mart, when the day is closed, may be seen the middle-class man, the mechanic, the clerk, and even the independent gentleman, looking down a street, perhaps in some forlorn suburb, for the number of the house which has been allotted him as his domicile for the night. He enters in. It contains the little apartment of a sick man, who had been found out by one of the brothers, or who had sent in his name to the office of the confraternity. He is ill, and he knew he would be

cared for, without the pain of leaving his home for the public hospital; and his wife needs rest, for she has been waiting on him all the day. The brother becomes his angel of charity, assists him to pray, and to turn his sufferings to good account; not shrinking from, but rejoicing in, the performance for him of all those offices, however lowly and repulsive, that poor humanity requires in its hour of sickness. He spends the whole night with him, leaving him in the morning to go and hear his mass in a neighbouring church, and then to return to his daily toil or avocation. On the following night the sick man is attended by another of these ministering angels; and so from night to night, until he is either restored to health, or is prepared to make a holy death. This is truly love for the brethren: that they who are at work during the day should gratuitously, and of their own free choice, rob themselves of their night's rest, and impose upon themselves a task irksome, and, it may be, revolting to nature, in order to minister comfort and assistance to some poor and suffering fellow Christian. The custom is truly Spanish; yet, essentially Catholic as it is, might it not become naturalized amongst ourselves?

The nation which gave birth to the order for the Redemption of Captives, and produced a S. John of God, with his mighty heart of charity for the sick and suffering, is still prolific in its inventions of brotherly love. In Barcelona the members of this confraternity amount to several hundreds, and the blessings they disseminate among themselves and the poor are known only to God and His holy angels. Rightly has Spain been styled "most Catholic;" for as it is the country into which the Catholic spirit most deeply penetrated in the ages that are gone for ever, so in these modern times, as we believe, there is none to be compared with it for the tenacity of its faith and the fervour of its charity—its heart is sound and pure, and its instincts are delicate and fine as in the days of its ancient piety.

The Holy Trinity, the Blessed Sacrament, the Passion of our Lord, the Dolours of Mary, her Immaculate Conception, S. Joseph, SS. Joachim and Anne, the Holy Souls, the Poor—these are the salient and marked devotions of the Spanish people. Each would require a separate article were we to do full justice to the deep faith and characteristic piety of this Catholic nation. The limits of a single paper are far too narrow for a picture of ways and habits, which are like the spreading roots of a tree with its delicate fibres, ramifying in all directions, and embracing the whole soil. Spain owes everything to its Catholicity: it is the creation of the Catholic

Church more than any other country. Religion has entered into the character of the people, and woven itself even into their language, in a manner and to a degree that find no parallel in any other nation.

And now we may be asked, is the portrait we have sketched a true representation of the present state of Spain? Is there no radically uncatholic spirit among her politicians, no remissness among her clergy, no neglect of sacraments, no working on Sundays, no ignorance, no religious indifference, among her people? Certainly faults and miseries exist; but we leave to others the task of the scavenger. If they believe that amid the rakings of sin and wretchedness they can find a treasure, let them make the heap and put their hands in it. Our object has been to speak of the actual fruits of Catholicity, not of the products of irreligion; to look upon an example which we may admire and imitate, not upon that which we should detest and shun. Surely the atmosphere in which we live is ungodly, worldly, and noisome enough to make us desire more refreshing scenes, and the taste of something less earthly than those maxims of material prosperity which abound among us.

We may subjoin, however, as a homage to the vitality of the faith and devotion of the Spanish people, and as an account of the difference in religious fervour between the last century and the present, a summary of the evils which have pressed upon the Church in Spain. In another country they would have been sufficient completely to have quenched the light of true religion. At the end of the last century, Regalism, Voltaireanism, and Jansenism had taken possession of the court, and held chairs in the universities of Salamanca and Alcalá. Then came the War of Independence: 600,000 French invaders, filled with the spirit of the Revolution, like the foxes of Samson, devastated the country, not only with the flames of war, but with impiety and unbelief. Thousands of simple, faithful Spaniards were sent prisoners to France, whence they returned to their homes, years after, as from a school of immorality and paganism. Next came, in 1809, the suppression by Joseph Bonaparte of all the religious communities: and it must be remembered that in the middle of the last century there were 2,104 houses of men alone (*vide* De la Fuente), numbering at least some 20,000 religious, who were something more than moral police; they were the teachers, pastors, and spiritual fathers of the people.

Then, upon the defeat and expulsion of the invader, were seen the first ripened fruits in Spain of the French school of revolution and infidelity. In 1835 and 1836 above a hundred priests were murdered, the report having been maliciously

spread that the clergy poisoned the drinking waters of the people. Between the years 1835 and 1837 all the monasteries and convents were again suppressed, and this finally; and the whole of their property sold or taken possession of by the Government. Many nuns died of hunger rather than leave their convents. A blow was also struck at the secular clergy. In 1835 a law was passed inhibiting any bishop from conferring Holy Orders and any Spaniard from receiving them: this law remained in force till 1844. In 1841 the property of all the secular clergy, bishops, chapters, and priests, was confiscated to the State. A small stipend was assigned them, wholly inadequate to their support, and often altogether withheld. In 1836 the eight metropolitan archbishops were dead, or in exile; and in 1841, out of nearly eighty episcopal sees scarcely ten had an occupant. To such a length did the evil reach that, in 1842, Señor Alonso brought forward in the Cortes a project of separation from Rome: the Cortes, however, refused to discuss it.

In October, 1844, Queen Isabella II. was declared of age, and from 1845 the Church began to breathe again and to resume her position in the nation. But who does not see, even from this brief summary, through what frightful trials the Church has had to pass for the space of seventy or eighty years? The wonder is, not that the spirit of religion is impaired, but that any has survived.

The material future of Spain may be confidently predicted: it must be prosperous; her natural resources are being for the first time opened out. Her religious future is not yet clear. The Church has been persecuted, injured, and maimed: her religious orders are still proscribed—she is therefore still in bondage. She is like an army in the field without auxiliaries—might we not add without cavalry and artillery? Her enemies are those of the century—impiety and revolution, which are widely spread, and are almost identical with democracy and modern liberalism. They have strongholds in Gibraltar and elsewhere; so much so, that we might well devote an entire article to the present active machinations and influence of English Protestantism in Spain, which is synonymous with revolution and impiety. Another remark we will hazard: In Spain the Government is what is called Constitutional; it is, however, but a poor, empty mockery of what we understand by constitutional government. Practically it is little better than a means whereby a few daring spirits, whose last thoughts are the spiritual or moral benefit of the country, are able to enact anti-Catholic laws and to impose them upon the nation. The nation at large takes no part in the constitution; it is worked

by the few. If the good would but use their political power, they might carry everything before them, and Spain might again present an example of a nation at once most Catholic and most prosperous ; but the good, although the majority, do not rise up and take their place and assert their rights. The people have from generation to generation been trained in the practice of submission to authority. The habit of obedience has become a portion of their moral nature ; and they have not yet taken in the idea of the principle upon which constitutional government is grounded—each power in the State acting as a check and counterpoise to the others ; the people meanwhile yielding but a bare obedience to the party which for the time being is in the ascendancy. The very machinery which the carrying out of this principle involves, helps to discredit it in their eyes. Struggle, agitation, canvassing at elections, continual political contest—these things never used to be called honourable, or useful, or virtuous, and the people are slow to understand how of a sudden, within a few years, they should have become, not only desirable, but laudable. In short, their traditions and their habits for centuries have been diametrically opposed to the whole spirit and action of constitutional government ; and as yet they neither perceive the duties, nor do they avail themselves of the power and the rights, consequent on the position which a new form of government has created. But this is not quite the whole account of the reason why the few are able to lord it over the many, and why the wicked triumph and the good succumb. The effrontery and boldness of vice are greater than the independence and courage of virtue, unless virtue has risen above the mean. There is nothing more lamentable than to see how the wicked few, as in Italy so in Spain, parade the standard of their own ungodliness and live up boldly to it in word and work, and how the good, though numerically superior, too often not only shrink back and hide themselves, as though they were ashamed of their own goodness, but even refuse boldly to unfurl the banner of the Cross of Christ. Sometimes in good faith, as if it were the only course left to them, sometimes from timidity, they disappear altogether from the scene, or they sue for peace, as if powerless to offer any effectual resistance—contenting themselves with exclaiming that the world is growing more and more evil, and misfortunes are coming upon them such as their fathers had never to endure. There is, however, a growing party in the country, including a small band of senators and deputies, who are manfully using their rights in the right cause, and are endeavouring to teach the multitude that new duties have fallen upon them, and that they must fulfil them,

if they love their country, and desire that religion should flourish as heretofore, and that God's honour should no longer be trampled on in Spain. May this small though noble company increase and multiply ! May they enlighten the eyes and strengthen the hands of their fellow-countrymen !

Will, then, the Church, crippled as she has been, and still is, be equal to her task ? We are no prophets. We believe in her innate power : will this power be appreciated and duly used ? The future will decide. We may note, however, as among the encouraging signs of the times,—1st, that the influence of the court, since the present universally esteemed saintly prelate has been its spiritual director, has been worthy of Spain's most Catholic days ; and that the queen is openly and avowedly pious, and devoted to the Church. 2nd, that a wonderful change has taken place in the higher ranks. A generation or two back the ideas of the Encyclopædia were a passport to society ; now they are an absolute bar to an entrance into it. Then, 3rd, as to the multitude, the best informed assert that, were the convents to be re-opened, they would at once be replenished again with abundant vocations. 4th, that nothing can exceed the simple faith and piety to be found in the small country towns and villages. If a priest goes to the church and rings the bell, the building is at once filled to hear him preach ; and it is a people most easily melted to contrition, and moved to make a full and sincere confession. When a retreat or mission is given, there is scarcely a man or woman in the place who does not attend and profit by it. We have known most touching examples of the effect of missions and retreats. There is no want of faith, no hardness of heart, none of that stolid indifference among the poor country people which we are familiar with in what are called more civilized countries. Missions, however, unfortunately, are comparatively rare, because the religious orders are destroyed. 5th,—and this is the most hopeful sign of all,—the ecclesiastical seminaries, those seed-plots of the Church, are increasing in number and efficiency ; the bishops watching over them with the tenderest care. The bishops themselves are well chosen, and are excellent men, thanks to the pious zeal and conscientiousness of the queen,—not of her ministers of State. Lastly, the Holy See—to which the Church of Spain has always been most loyally and conspicuously devoted—in the Concordat of 1851, obtained a pledge from the Government to exclude from the Spanish dominions every other form of religion but that of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman (*vide* 1st article of Concordat). We mention these points, not by way of discussion or as exhausting the subject, but as testifying to the deep impression which

the Catholic faith has made on the Spanish people, so that not the waters of many years of suffering and impiety have been able to efface it.

The following passage is so much to the point that we think we do well to transcribe it. The writer, as a Protestant, confounds the obedience rendered to the divine authority of the Church with "a blind submission to priestly authority," and, as an American citizen, identifies the honour paid to rulers and superiors with "loyalty to mere rank and place;" but his testimony to the sterling qualities of the Spanish people is not the less valuable on that account; perhaps only the more so. "The law of progress is on Spain for good or for evil, as it is on the other nations of the earth; and her destiny, like theirs, is in the hand of God, and will be fulfilled. The material resources of her soil and position are as great as those of any people that now occupies its meted portion of the globe. The mass of her inhabitants, and especially of her peasants, has been less changed, and in many respects less corrupted, by the revolutions of the last century, than any of the nations who have pressed her borders, or contended with her power. They are the same race of men who twice drove back the Crescent from the shores of Europe, and twice saved from shipwreck the great cause of Christian civilization. They have shown the same spirit at Saragossa that they showed two thousand years before at Saguntum. They are not a ruined people. And while they preserve the sense of honour, the sincerity, and the contempt for what is sordid and base, that have so long distinguished their national character, they cannot be ruined."—*Ticknor's "History of Spanish Literature,"* vol. iii. p. 323.

With respect to the custom of dancing before the Blessed Sacrament (alluded to at p. 11), we have received the following additional particulars since the article was in type: "*Within* the church there is the dance at the Christmas midnight Mass, in the Cathedral of Seville. It is performed by six little choir-boys in the sanctuary, and is called *de los Seises*. *Outside* the church you have dancing at any village procession of Corpus Christi, by some graceful lads, castanet in hand, who keep carefully a backward step. Occasionally a few girls will take their place to sing a *loa* of praise and triumph (in the same position), at intervals in the procession. The "*Pange Lingua*" is sung by all present, alternating with the dance, until they return to the porch of the church, when the hymn alone is heard. The same thing occurs in the processions of August 15th, September 8th, and December 8th, before the image of the Blessed Virgin, when it is carried beyond the church door with cross, banner, and canopy. On all such occasions a play is acted in the afternoon, in the open air, by the youthful performers, which is succeeded by a general dance."

ART. II.—THE ABYSSINIAN SCHISM.

1. *Ludolfi Historia Æthiopica*. Francofurti ad Mænum. 1681.
2. *Bruce's Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile*. 5 vols. Edinburgh, 1790.
3. *The Highlands of Æthiopia*. By Major Harris. 3 vols. London : Longmans. 1844.
4. *Life in Abyssinia*. By Mansfield Parkyns. 2 vols. London : J. Murray. 1853.
5. *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours in Eastern Africa*. By the Rev. Dr. Krapf. London : Trübner & Co. 1860.
6. *Wanderings among the Fálashas of Abyssinia*. By Rev. H. Stern. London : Wertheim, Macintosh, & Hunt. 1862.

AMONG the primitive schisms and heresies which have existed, age after age, in a sort of petrified state, in the wide regions of the East, the Abyssinian state Church holds a singular place. It deserves our attention on several grounds : for example, as a disfigured relic of the missionary successes of the Catholic Church in the important times of S. Athanasius ; as a Christian community still exhibiting that admixture of Judaism which turns us back in thought to the earliest Christian converts and their peculiar difficulties, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles ; as an involuntary witness to the Catholic Church, on the one hand, by its even exaggerated admission of certain practices alleged by Protestants to be only innovations of Rome, and on the other, by the vague and contradictory character of its doctrines, accounted for by its long-continued separation from the supreme authority of Catholic truth ; finally, as the religious organization of a barbarous people, who are both physically and politically of much interest to the student of history—in the former respect, as holding, in an ethnological point of view, a sort of midway position between the Caucasian and Negro races ; in the latter, as affording the solitary instance in Africa of a degree of civilization that exceeds the savage culture of kingdoms like Dahomey. The Abyssinians probably have been a nation of much higher rank than they are at present : they possess regular institutions modelled on the Christian type, however debased ; and they have a literature apparently much resembling that of the earlier mediæval period of Europe, and a learned class possessed of a cultivation not despicable, considering their opportunities.

So that we may safely predict at least this much, that if Africa, as many well-informed thinkers believe, is one day to be raised from the degradation in which it has grovelled throughout so many ages, Abyssinia is destined to play some great part in such restoration. If we add to all this, the history of its civil revolutions, highly curious as those of an empire in much the state of the early times of Saxon England; its reconstruction, in our days, we may almost say, whilst we write, by a barbarian conqueror of great ability, Kasai, or Theodorus, whose name scarcely reached Europe amidst the tumult of our own Russian war; the heroic efforts of the Society of Jesus in the seventeenth century to reclaim this fallen Church, then but just becoming known to Europe, which had hitherto heard of it only as the mythical kingdom of Prester John; the repeated exertions of late years made by Mgr. de Jacobis and his illustrious companions for the same object, ending alike in their sufferings and expulsion, as though individuals only, and not whole communities, as a general rule, are permitted the grace of being converted from schism,—if, we say, these fields of inquiry be added to the foregoing, the reader will perceive that the whole subject is not only one of unusual interest, but that, in order to its just treatment, we cannot include in the compass allotted to an article more than a limited portion of the entire discussion. What we propose, therefore, to confine ourselves to at present is the constitution, doctrine, and ceremonies of the Abyssinian Church, premising some account of the early relations of the Abyssinian people to the Jewish nation, and of their conversion in the fourth century.

The sources of our information are chiefly the great work of Ludolf; the modern travellers in Abyssinia, such as Bruce, and, in our own times, Harris, Parkyns, Krapf, and Stern; the letters relating to Mgr. Massaia's and Mgr. de Jacobis' mission in the "*Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*," and some MS. letters from a native Abyssinian priest, written from the country in the years 1853-55, and kindly communicated to us by the respected ecclesiastic to whom, then at Rome, they were addressed.

Abyssinia, in classical and ecclesiastical language *Æthiopia*, called by its inhabitants *Hábesh*, is an extensive region of somewhat undefined limits, stretching from Sennaar and Tàka north to beyond the Galla countries on the south, and from the White Nile to the Red Sea east and west. It formed for many ages one empire under sovereigns claiming descent from Menilek, son of the queen of Saba (or Sheba, to use the name more familiar to English literature) by Solomon, and called by the title of *Negus*. But from the sixteenth century this empire

was broken up by invasion and intestine disorders into three great divisions, Amhàra, Tigrè, and Shoa, each under its own rulers, though paying an empty deference to the shadowy representative of the line of Solomon, who still remained at Gondar, as he does even now, like the king of Delhi under British dominion till the times of the Indian mutiny. As we said above, the whole or almost the whole of the ancient empire of Abyssinia has lately been reunited by a successful adventurer, who has caused himself to be anointed emperor by the Abuna, or Metropolitan of Abyssinia, of whose office we shall have much to say further on. The legend of the connection of ancient Æthiopia with Judæa is worth relating, however mixed up with fable. It is recorded in the ancient chronicle, entitled *Kebir Za Negust*, or "Glory of the Kings" (Mr. Parkyns thinks the rendering should rather be "Deeds of the Kings"), annals of which the historical value for early times is certainly not great, since they declare that the world was divided by direct inheritance from Adam into the two great empires of Ittopia and Romia, the former possessing all regions to the south of Jerusalem, the latter all the north. According to this authority, Maqueda, Queen of Æthiopia, having heard from the merchant Tamerin of the wisdom of King Solomon, undertook a visit to him, and remained for a time in the land of Israel. On her return, she bore a son to the Jewish monarch, whom she called Menilek, and who was afterwards sent to be educated at the court of his father. When he had grown up, he came back to Æthiopia, attended by Hebrew nobles from every tribe, and a body of elders under Azarias, son of Zadok, the high-priest, and carrying with him the ark of the covenant and the tables of the law, which he had, by a pious theft, taken out of the temple, the doors of it having been miraculously opened for that purpose. The ark is believed by the Abyssinians to be preserved in the celebrated church of Axum, called Hedar Tsion, under the custody of an officer called Nabrid. The Queen of Saba resigned the throne in favour of her son, and at her death ordained that no female should in future sway the Æthiopian sceptre, and that the princes not succeeding to the throne should be kept prisoners in a mountain fortress, an institution actually observed for ages in Abyssinia, and which has supplied the idea of the beautiful romance of "Rasselas," which, however, gives a picture of splendid captivity little resembling the reality of the *duressse* to which these unfortunate descendants of royalty were subjected.

The line of Menilek held the dominion over Æthiopia undisturbed till the year A.D. 960, when it sustained a rude shock from the Jewish population themselves, who had sprung from

the settlers sent forth in the time of Solomon. These people, called Fálashas, had become very powerful, and when the Abyssinian emperors accepted Christianity in the fourth century, they refused to give up their national faith, elected a Hebrew sovereign, and seized the mountain fastnesses of Simien and Bellesa, where for several centuries they abode under kings and queens called invariably Gideon and Judith. In the middle of the tenth century, a princess of this race, called Esther (by the Amhara, Issat, signifying "fire"), a heroine of daring and unscrupulous character, seized the opportunity of an epidemic which had carried off the emperor and weakened Abyssinia, to surprise the rock Damo, where the captive princes of the royal house resided, massacred them all, and proclaimed herself queen. The infant successor to the imperial throne, however, was saved, and escaped into Shoa, with which fragment of the old empire his descendants were contented for many generations, whilst the dominion over the rest of Abyssinia passed after a time into the hands of a Christian family. In the thirteenth century, the representative of this family was induced by Tekla Haimanot, the most celebrated of the saints of the Abyssinian schism, to resign in favour of the then chief of the house of Menilek, who transmitted the power as well as the title of Negus of Abyssinia to his successors until the disruption of the empire to which we have adverted, and to enter into details of which is beyond the design of the present article. The arrangement made by Tekla Haimanot included stipulations affecting the Church, which we shall afterwards notice. It is called in Abyssinian history, "The Era of Partition." The Fálashas maintained an independent existence under their own princes until the beginning of the seventeenth century, but were at length driven out of their mountain district, and scattered through the Amhara, where they are still found living in their separate villages in the provinces of Dunbea, Quara, Woggera, Tschelga, and Godjam. They form a very remarkable fragment of the Jewish people, and their presence derives the greater attraction from the striking Jewish features which the Christianity of the Abyssinian schism presents.

The conversion of Abyssinia to Christianity, according to a general and credible tradition, commenced in the year 330, and was brought about in the following way: Meropius, a Tyrian merchant, landed on the Æthiopian coast on his way to India, and was murdered by the natives, who made slaves of his two sons, Frumentius and Edesius. These captives were brought to the court of the emperor, where their abilities and discretion gave them a prevailing influence, which enabled them ere long

to induce the monarch to embrace Christianity, and by his example to lead a great number of his subjects in the same direction. As soon as these happy results were brought about, Frumentius proceeded to Alexandria to report the victories of the cross, and to receive advice and aid from S. Athanasius, who at that time sat on the patriarchal throne of S. Mark. The heroic champion of orthodoxy joyfully received the humble missionary, who had achieved such glories in an untrodden field, consecrated him bishop of the region which he had won to the faith, and again sent him forth to consolidate the conquest so happily commenced. To this day, the Church of Abyssinia, now, alas, immersed both in schism and heresy, pays to Frumentius (under the name of Abba Salama) the same honours which England owes to her Augustine, and Ireland to her Patrick. The following passages from the *Encomia*, used in the Abyssinian churches, will witness to the devotion which has survived even the apostasy of so many centuries:—

I bid hail to him with the voice of gladness,
Magnifying and extolling him ;
Salama, the door of mercy and clemency,
Who caused the splendour of the light of Christ to arise in Æthiopia,
When (aforetime) there had been in it clouds and darkness.

And again :—

I bid thee hail, Salama, who wast commanded
To manifest the hidden doctrine ;
For it rose in Æthiopia, like the morning star.
By thy holy light and pleasant beauty
Even unto this day Æthiopia rejoices and is glad.

In the next century a great number of missionaries flocked into Æthiopia from the Oriental Churches. The statement of the chronicle of Axum is that “very many monks came from Rome” (meaning, most probably, by this the Roman Empire) “and filled the whole kingdom.” Among these great names, forgotten in the western world, nine are held in special reverence by the Abyssinians—the Abba Aragawi, Pantaleon, Garima, Alif, Sakam, Aflo, Likanos, Adimatus, and Og. Miracles of a stupendous kind are freely ascribed to them, such as moving mountains, quieting stormy seas, and raising the dead. In some of the features of Abyssinian hagiology there is a character of grotesque wildness, which must be noticed in forming a judgment of the nature of their popular belief. Thus Samuel, one of their saints, rides upon a lion ; and in the life of Tekla Haimanot, the great monastic hero of mediæval

Æthiopia (if we may use that epithet in speaking of a country whose history has never passed out of the period which answers to it), we read of evil-minded monks cutting the rope by which the saint was being drawn up the precipitous rock of Debra Damo, whereupon six wings immediately sprout from his body and bear him in safety to the summit. Whilst we admit that incidents almost as marvellous might be quoted from Catholic legends, and whilst we place no limits to the extent and manner of operation of supernatural power, the miracles authenticated by authority in the Catholic Church have, nevertheless, on the whole, a certain gravity which is far indeed from appearing in the religious chronicles of a nation at once heretical and barbarous.

Abyssinia, though so easily and prosperously converted to the Catholic faith, remained obedient to it for little more than a century. In the great Monophysite controversy, which was settled at the council of Chalcedon in 451, she rejected the authoritative decision of the Church, and has ever since been ranked among the Monophysite communities. There is no doubt that practically this is what the Abyssinian position comes to, but it will be instructive to examine how it was brought about, and what defence is alleged by the Abyssinians themselves for their own conclusions.

The heresy of Eutyches carried him into a direction the exact opposite of the previous heresy of Nestorius. The one had maintained that there were two persons in Christ, a divine and a human; the other was so far from admitting a duality of persons, that he even denied a duality of natures; and, whilst admitting that two distinct natures were really united, he contended that the union itself obliterated all distinction between them; the divinity so absorbing the humanity that the latter was lost and disappeared in its immensity. Hence he denied that our Lord's body was of the same substance as ours. Eutyches having been condemned and deprived by a synod held at Constantinople, appealed to the emperor Theodosius: another council was held at Ephesus, under the presidency of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, which was characterized by such outrages, that it goes, as is well known, under the name of the *Latrocinium*, or "Robbers' gang." Dioscorus refused to allow a letter of Pope Leo to be presented to the council, had even the temerity to excommunicate him, obtained the signatures of the assembled bishops to a blank document, and by such means, and by violence, in consequence of which S. Flavian lost his life, succeeded in getting the deprivation of Eutyches revoked. It was not to be expected that matters could be allowed to rest there. At the council of Chalcedon—thanks principally to the firmness of the Papal

legates, the Catholic doctrine was set forth with the utmost clearness, and those were anathematized who held a resclution into one, of our Lord's two natures. It was declared that the difference of the natures was in no way annulled by their union, but the peculiar essence of each was preserved in one person and one subsistence—not as though they were severed into two persons, but existing in one and the same only-begotten Son, the Divine Word, Jesus Christ. This definition therefore both re-affirmed the previous condemnation of Nestorius, whom the Eutychians pretended that the Catholic doctrine would favour, and censured their own error, which, though in another direction, struck equally at our belief in the Incarnation. Dioscorus, though thrice cited to appear before the council, refused to come, and for this reason, as well as because he had ventured to excommunicate Pope Leo, was deprived by the council of his episcopal dignity, and removed from all priestly functions. Both he and Eutyches were banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia.

What the views of Dioscorus were, is not very clear. He was not personally condemned on a point of faith, but for his insolence to the Holy See, and for his contumacy in refusing to appear before the council. He seems, however, to have adopted a middle course—to have flinched from maintaining with his friend Eutyches that the humanity disappeared after the union—but to have held that Christ was *from* two natures, whilst he would not declare that there were two natures *in* Christ. He probably bore the same relation to the downright Eutychians, that Anglicanism does to the decided Protestantism that surrounds it. And just as Anglicanism shrinks from identifying itself positively with those to whom its attractions necessarily lead it, so to this day the Abyssinians refuse to be called Monophysites, whilst all but themselves can see that the distinctions which separate them do not constitute a difference. We are told by Bruce, a traveller, who, though a Protestant, had evidently a mind naturally well adapted for theological discussions, that scarce any would suffer it to be said that Christ's body was perfectly like ours, and that it was easily seen that in their hearts they were very loth to believe, if they did believe it at all, that the body of the Virgin Mary and S. Anne were perfectly human.*

What they allege about Dioscorus is this: that he had complained heavily of being wronged, that he had not followed Eutyches, or denied or confounded the divinity or humanity of Christ; but had only refused to acknowledge the word *Nature*,

* Bruce's Travels, book v. chap. xii.

as common to the divinity and humanity, and only taught that two persons should not be asserted in Christ, contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church and to the council of Ephesus, which he insisted would follow if we admitted two natures and two wills in Him. They contend that the word Nature means something created; that two wills are inconceivable, and that human nature in glory has no difference in will from the Divine. We here remark the self-will and inconsistency of heresy. The same people who already accepted the word Person in speaking of the Blessed Trinity, hesitated at a word not at all more open to the metaphysical objections to which all language is liable when endeavouring to express ideas which appertain to the Divine. It is also instructive to observe that the Eutychians, just like those who apostatized from the Catholic Church on such widely different grounds more than a thousand years later, appealed against her views to the supposed doctrines of the past, charging her with innovation. That past was imaginary, in any sense that would have assisted their argument. The saints and doctors who lived in it were prepared to accept the judgment of the Church on any point of controversy whenever it should be issued, and already held, by implication, all future definitions. The expressions of the earlier Fathers, on which Eutyches relied, would at once have been withdrawn by them, had it then been apparent that the mind of the Church, always the same, though not always by all persons equally understood, required a different formula for its complete declaration upon any point. To resume: whatever is to be thought of the tradition of the Æthiopians about the defence of Dioscorus, there is no doubt that they eagerly followed in the wake of their mother Church of Egypt, whose army of fanatical monks had formed the strength of its unscrupulous leader at Ephesus. They called the council of Chalcedon a "council of fools," and styled the Catholics Chalcedonians, just as Anglicans have styled the Catholics of the present day 'Tridentines.

The heresiarch Dioscorus is enrolled among the saints of the Abyssinian calendar, has more than one festival in his honour, and is thus celebrated in the Abyssinian hymnology:—

Hail to Dioscorus, who laughed to scorn the religion [of the king],*

Whilst he (the king) divided the unity of God and man.

That he might strengthen those who were there, the disciples of his religion.

The hairs which had been torn from his beard, and those of his teeth which had been knocked out,

As the fruit of his faith, he sent into a distant region.

* The Catholic religion was thus styled by the heretics, because it was supported at the time by the Imperial authority. The term "Melchites," (from the Hebrew for a king) was similarly applied to the Catholics.

Ecclesiastical history tells us that Dioscorus was not present at the council, and makes no mention of this tale of violence. We are tempted to think that by a sort of mythical inversion the heresiarch is here described as the victim of the very outrages which he or his partizans had inflicted upon S. Flavian. From this epoch, the Church of Æthiopia of course is to be regarded as a branch severed from the true vine, and left to itself. All branches when parted from their parent stock, either wither or exhibit only the false vitality of rottenness. The latter seems most conspicuous in the schism we now contemplate. Whilst they keep up, age after age, customs which are partly abuses, partly compliances only permitted in the infancy of the Church; whilst they look back with a dull, uniform gaze to a remote period, since which the Catholic Church, under the rule of the successors of S. Peter, has run such a giant's course, the Abyssinians are nevertheless agitated by restless controversies, which keep them incessantly in motion, but without progression. We shall presently consider, in greater detail, the nature of these disputes; but it appears proper first to place before the reader an account of the constitution of the Abyssinian Church, now that we have seen it come into separate existence by its act of apostasy in the fifth century.

The chief ecclesiastical ruler of the Abyssinians is the *Abuna*, or primate. This dignitary, whose title signifies "Father," is claimed, on the authority of apocryphal canons of the council of Nice, to have held, in the early Church, the seventh place in councils held in Greece, next after the prelate of Seleucia. Since 1282, the time of Tekla Haimanot, he has always been nominated by the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria. His duty is to ordain priests and deacons, to consecrate the king, to bless the ark—an object of religious reverence in churches which the Abyssinians have borrowed from Judaism; and generally to govern the Church, in which office he is associated with the *Étchequé*—the superior, or, as we should call him, father-general of all the monks in Abyssinia. The Abuna is held in profound reverence by the people, who, as he travels, prostrate themselves before him in the dust; and he is described, when granting interviews to Europeans, as surrounded with a good deal of barbaric display, seated in a scarlet-covered chair, and wrapped up in silks. He has, in various ways, very considerable power. For example, all matters of dispute in which ecclesiastics are concerned, are referred to his adjudication; public confession of grave offences is made to him, and he assigns penances, occasionally of a magnitude resembling those we read of in the primitive ages; he also has the authority to restrain, by severe penalties, what it pleases him to con-

demn as heresy. To him is referred, by the king, the question of allowing or prohibiting the residence of strangers who come to Abyssinia for religious purposes ; his displeasure has been a principal cause of the expulsion of Catholic missionaries, and his favour has enabled Anglicans to settle in the country. The present Abuna, the Abba Salama, was educated at Cairo, in the Church of England School kept by Mr. Lieder, one of the German missionaries connected with the Anglican establishment ; and the effect of his early training is apparent in his whole policy. Strictly speaking, the Abuna appears to be the only bishop recognized by the Abyssinians in the country. There is, indeed, another officer called the *Comus*, a title which is usually rendered bishop ; but although he ranks next above the priests, his position is evidently not episcopal, for he has neither diocese nor jurisdiction over the clergy ; his duties (if Major Harris was rightly informed), being simply to bless and purify the arks if defiled by the touch of deacon or layman (when a Mahometan has touched one, the purification is reserved to the Abuna himself) ; to repeat the prayer of admission, and to sign the cross on the skull-cap of persons admitted to the monastic vows. Priests are ordained by the Abuna, by the ceremony of breathing upon them, and as it is generally impossible, in consequence of the ignorance and carelessness of the Abyssinians, to ascertain the age of candidates, it is merely required, as a proof of the due age having been attained, that the beard shall have appeared. As regards education, candidates for the priesthood must be able to read, to repeat the Nicene Creed, and possess by heart the psalms and the Abyssinian hymnarium. Their duties are to baptize, to administer the Holy Eucharist, and to sing the litanies. Like the priests of the Greek Church, they may not marry after ordination. Deacons are chosen from among very young persons, the corruption of manners, common in Abyssinia, making it believed that the requisite purity is not to be expected among candidates of a more advanced age. They act as acolytes, and are alone permitted to bake the bread which is used in the celebration of the Eucharist. For this purpose there is attached to each church a small edifice called the Bethlehem. Sub-deacons are also named among the clergy.

The revenues of the churches are managed by a lay officer called the *Alaka*, and named by the king. He might be compared to the *Vidame*, or lay-noble who, in mediæval Europe, used to be chosen by monasteries to protect their secular interests. Till recently, a third of the Abyssinian territory was in the hands of the clergy, and untaxed ; but under the rule of the present king Theodorus, a great change has been effected in

this respect. He issued an edict sequestering the whole of the church property, and appointing for each church two priests and three deacons, with small tracts of land. The opposition made to this spoliation was so great that he was compelled to reserve the execution for a time, but it came into force in 1860.

Monks are very numerous in Abyssinia, but they are on a completely different footing from religious in the Catholic Church. In the first place, they do not live in monasteries, but each in his hut, round a church in an enclosed village. They may cultivate farms, exercise civil functions, and go about where they like, being, in fact, hardly distinguishable from laymen except for their *schema* (a sort of scapular) and cross. They therefore, perhaps, resemble the tertiaries of some orders or monastic institutions in their most primitive forms, like the Essenes. In these, as in many other features of the Abyssinian and Greek schisms, we behold very early characteristics of Christian society, fixed as though by a frost. Catholicism has grown and put forth leaves; they retain their unnatural aspect of a stationary infancy. Each monastic society is independent of the rest, and under its own abbot, yet all appear to be under the general control of the *Etchequé*. This dignitary more especially presides over the monks of Debra Libanos. Another class are called the monks of S. Eustathius, and are governed by the superior of the convent of Mahebar Selsasse, in the north-west corner of Abyssinia. There are also convents of nuns.

Next after the clergy and monks, we should mention a remarkable class in Abyssinia, the *debterahs*. They answer to the scribes in the Jewish church, and are the learned order, but do not receive ordination, nor are considered as clerics, though no religious ceremony is complete without their presence. Protestant travellers speak in very indifferent terms of their moral character, as they do of the Abyssinians generally. We read, however, with pleasure, in a letter of Mgr. de Jacobis,* a much kinder estimate of these depositaries of the learning of a barbarous but interesting country. According to his account, all the education in Abyssinia is furnished by the Church, and what we should call schools and colleges are attached to some religious foundation, and never superintended by laymen. The teachers are generally, he says, priests or monks, and where such are not to be had, simple debterahs, or laureat-masters, appointed by the emperor. This may not be inconsistent with the latter being regarded as the learned class, any more than in European countries, where education has often been controlled by ecclesiastics, whilst the literary order, though not

* *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, vol. xii. p. 345.

regularly organized, has been distinct from the Church. In describing the habits of life by which such education as Abyssinia can give is obtained, we are reminded of the "hedge-schools" of Ireland, where so much sound knowledge was painfully and generously learned before the revolution effected by the national system. The teachers, it appears, are miserably paid in Abyssinia. Their remuneration reminds us of the *diarium* of a Roman slave. They receive twenty-four measures of corn per annum, weighing about fifty pounds, and four *amulié*, a small coin equal to about two shillings of our money. But poor as the material reward of learning may be, the love of it, for its own sake, is such, that an Abyssinian student will cheerfully leave his family with a bag of dried peas on his shoulder, and beg when it is exhausted. He acts as the servant of his teacher, like the scholars of mediæval Oxford, and in return for these sacrifices is trained, for what seems a lifetime, in the circle of Æthiopian science. Seven years are devoted to the *Ziema*, or church-music; nine years to *Suasuo*, or grammar; four to *Chanien*, or poetry; ten to the *Chedusan-Metzahft*, or sacred books of the Old and New Testaments. We are not informed how far these courses are carried on simultaneously. Civil and canon law, astronomy and history, form a higher course, which is attempted by but few students. Mgr. de Jacobis estimates the value of this system as follows:—

In reality, all this labour gives little knowledge, always excepting the study of the Holy Scriptures, which supplies to the heart its noble inspirations, to the mind its luminous guidance, and to all the social relations of life its justice, delicacy, and charity. In this respect, a simple *debtetah* of Abyssinia is greatly superior to many European scholars.*

They include in the canons of the Old Testament the various books treated by the Protestants as apocryphal. On the other hand they include in the New Testament a collection called *Synodus*, which contains the apostolic constitutions and Clementine canons, though with a good deal of variation. These they regard as absolutely of the same authority as the writings of the apostles and evangelists. Next in reverence to these they hold the acts of the general councils preceding that which dates their apostasy; viz., Nice (the first), Constantinople (the first), and Ephesus; besides those of certain provincial councils, Ancyra, Cæsarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, and Sardis.

The Abyssinians hold with the Greek schism, the heresy that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only. Ludolf, it is true, says, and we can well believe him, that the Abba

* Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, vol. xii. pp. 345-6.

Gregorius told him that the Abyssinians do hold that the Holy Ghost is equally of the Father and of the Son, but that they reject the term "proceeding;" and when asked by the historian to account for this circumstance, the Abyssinian ecclesiastic asked him first to explain what he meant by "proceeding," and insisted on sticking, in this matter, to the very words of Scripture. In the same spirit, a prelate of the Anglican Church, quoting certain terms in reference to the Blessed Trinity, which the more learned and orthodox of the Protestants have retained from Catholic theology, asks, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" * What result comes of this presumptuous rejection of the words by which the Catholic Church has at once expressed and fortified the most necessary doctrine, may be judged of by the confusion into which these scrupulous Abyssinian divines have fallen, in course of time, on the doctrines for which they profess such reverence. The Anglo-German missionary Krapf, who is not likely on such a point to bear false testimony against them, tells us that in the Abyssinian theology "in the presence of the Father, [the Son] recedes into the background, just as before the Father and the Son the Holy Ghost dwindles almost into nothingness" (p. 39). We here, to say the least of it, observe something of the darkness of Judaism, as in so many other features of the Abyssinian system. And by way of showing the tendencies of thought among the people on this subject, we may here notice an old Abyssinian heresy, that of Tzagazaaba, mentioned by Ludolf, who maintained that Christ was Son of Himself, and ἀρχή of Himself.

At the present day the Abyssinian Church is torn in pieces by controversies concerning a branch of the doctrine of the Incarnation. It would appear from a catechism written out for Ludolf in the seventeenth century by the above-named Gregorius that they had always placed in some prominence "the two nativities of Christ," viz., the first, as they expressed it, "by His Father, without mother, and without time;" the second, "by the Virgin Mary, our Lady, without father, and in time." It must also be mentioned, in order to understand the spirit of the Abyssinian Church on this head, that, in common with all the Eastern Churches, they make very much of the mystery of our Lord's baptism in the Jordan, their celebration of which we shall have occasion to notice further on. Now, about sixty years ago, there arose a monk at Gondar, who promulgated a doctrine commonly styled "the three births." As stated by Krapf, the dispute is as follows:—

* Whately's "Logic," App. art. "Person."

The dogma of the three births . . . consists in the assertion that the baptism or consecration of Christ with the Holy Ghost in the river Jordan constituted His third birth. According to some, the Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds (first birth), became man in time (second birth); but, according to others, Christ in the Virgin's womb was already anointed, prayed, fasted, and so forth. And this they call His third birth.

Major Harris, though a soldier, has given a more compact statement of the question. He says:—

At the expense of a bloody civil war, Gondar, with Gojam, Damet, and all the south-western provinces of Amhára, has long maintained the three births of Christ—Christ proceeding from His Father from all eternity, styled “the eternal birth;” His incarnation, as being born of the Holy Virgin, termed His “second or temporal birth;” and His reception of the Holy Ghost in the womb, denominated His “third birth.”—(vol. iii. p. 186.)

But the correspondence of a native Catholic priest of Abyssinia, to which we have already referred, enables us to perceive much more clearly than hitherto the nature and bearings of this remarkable controversy in the heretical Church of these remote latitudes of Africa. The letter which we proceed to quote bears date the 29th May, 1855. It is written in Italian, with the exception of a portion in Latin which we lay before the reader as it stands, subjoining also a translation:—

You must know that all the schismatics of Abyssinia are divided into three classes, and those of one class cannot communicate with those of another. These are, the *Tanahide*, which signifies Union; the *Kabat*, which is Unction; and the *Segga Lege*, which is the Son of Grace; so that one may call these the Unionists, Unctionists, Gratians, or better, Adoptionists. The question which divides them consists in this: viz., *Utrum Christus, ut homo, fit filius Dei naturalis per unionem hypostaticam, an per gratiam unionis, an per unctionem Spiritus Sancti, an per gratiam habitualement*? *Primæ classis dicunt, per unionem hypostaticam tantum independenter ab unctione Spiritus Sancti, immo excludunt et rejiciunt gratiam habitualement tanquam superfluum in Christo, quia, ut ipsi dicunt, ipse est Unctio, Ungens et Unctus. Secundæ classis dicunt, independenter ab unionem hypostaticam, per unctionem tantum, quæ fit in ipso unionis actu, non decursu temporis, neque enim est sermo de septem donis Spiritus Sancti. Tertiæ classis cum secundis conveniunt in uno modo et discrepant in altero; negant quidem per unionem hypostaticam esse contra primæ sententiæ fautores; et affirmant cum secundis unctionem esse gratiam habitualement in Christo, negant tamen contra eosdem quod fit filius naturalis, sed gratiæ, seu adoptivus.* [Whether Christ, as man, is made the natural Son of God by the hypostatical union, or by the grace of union, or by the unction of the Holy Spirit, or by habitual grace? Those of the first class say, by the hypostatical union only, independently of the unction of the Holy Spirit; nay, they exclude and reject habitual grace as a superfluous thing in Christ, because, as they say, He is Himself the Unction, the Anointer, and the Anointed. Those of the

second class say, independently of the hypostatical union, by the unction only, which takes place in the very act of union, not in the passage of time (for the discourse here is not concerning the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit). Those of the third class agree with the second in one way and differ in another; they deny indeed, against those who favour the first opinion, that it is by the hypostatical union; and they affirm with the second that the unction is habitual grace in Christ, but still deny, against the same, that He is made the natural son, but of grace, or by adoption.] The Copts have always been in favour of the first, yet they permit the other two to hold their doctrines as opinions; and as often as the bishops have attempted to unite them to the first, and still more to excommunicate them, they have had to beat a retreat from their capital, or residence of Gondar. Now the present bishop, a pupil of the English, and a Protestant and fanatic, has sought to bring them back to unity by the sword, and has succeeded, without, however, contenting any one of the parties: not favouring the first, because he says He received the unction of the Holy Spirit, nor favouring the two others, because he says He received it, but does not say what He became, the natural or adopted [Son]. Wherefore, the persecution has not been against the Catholics only, but also against the schismatics themselves, with the difference that the schismatics have suddenly yielded what they had maintained as of faith, whilst the Catholics have been suffering afflictions, and are suffering them continually, from the month of July last year to the present time, are groaning in chains, bound hand and foot, scourged, in some cases with fifty, and in others up to sixty or seventy blows, and thrust into underground dungeons. And thus stand things up to the present moment.

Of these views, that of the Adoptionists appears to coincide with the first opinion mentioned by Krapf, that of the Unionists with the second, and that of the Uctionists with the third. According to Major Harris, the Unionists (we adopt the term for convenience, though he does not use it) "deny the third birth upon the grounds that the reception of the Holy Ghost cannot be so styled." He adds that their faction is called by the opprobrious epithet of *Karra Haimanot*, or Knife of the Faith, as having lopped off an acknowledged scriptural truth. A statement on the whole subject, by Dr. Gobat, Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem (quoted by Mr. Parkyns), will throw some additional light on the matter. After remarking, even more strongly than our MS. authority, that the three parties are so inimical to each other that they curse one another, and will no longer partake of the sacrament together, he proceeds:—

One party is of opinion that, when it is said that Jesus Christ was anointed with the Holy Spirit, it is meant that the Godhead was united with the human nature of Jesus Christ; and that in all the passages of the Bible where the Holy Spirit is represented as having been given to Jesus Christ, the name Holy Spirit only signifies the divinity of Christ, who had no need

of the assistance of the Holy Spirit, whom He could not receive, having always possessed Him. Their manner of expressing themselves is, that Jesus Christ *has* anointed; that He *has been* anointed; and that He himself *is* the unction. This party is chiefly in Tigré—the most exasperated one. Their doctrine was that of the last Coptic Abuna. The second opinion is, that when it is said that Jesus Christ was anointed with the Holy Spirit, it is signified merely that the Holy Spirit accomplished the union of the Godhead with the human nature in the person of Jesus Christ. This party is principally to be found in the provinces of Godjam and Lasta. The third opinion, predominating in all the other provinces of Abyssinia, and even in Shoa, is, that Jesus Christ, as man, and though united to the Godhead from the moment of His conception, received the Holy Ghost in the human part of His nature, in the same manner as we receive Him—viz., as a gift of the Father—in order that He might be enabled to accomplish, as man, the work of our redemption: whence they conclude that, because Jesus Christ received the Holy Spirit as we receive Him, His unction is to be called a third birth. These are the most tolerant. I have understood that, after my departure from Gondar, some of the most learned men left off calling this unction of Jesus Christ a birth. It appears that these differences of opinion are founded upon the different views they have adopted of the two natures of Jesus Christ; although, according to the letter, they are all Monophysites.

Whatever estimate is to be formed of the dogma of the three-fold birth, it has taken a great hold of the Abyssinian people, and the apparent unity which the coercive measures of the present Abuna have effected is perhaps only superficial. His opposition to the favourite doctrine exposed him for years to much personal danger. His house at Gondar was pillaged by the mob, and he had to fly into Tigré. On the accession of Theodorus, his enemies attempted to have him deposed; but he was supported by the emperor, who caused proclamation to be made that “His Majesty approved of the scriptural doctrine of the Abuna, and that in future all who adhered to the obnoxious dogma of the three-fold birth should be taught obedience by the giraffe” [or whip]. This was in vain protested against by the Shoa clergy. At present, a solemn abjuration of the doctrine forms as regular a part of the Abyssinian ordination service as the supremacy oath does of the Anglican. Mr. Stern tells us: “All being ranged before the chair of St. Mark, each candidate solemnly abjures the old heresy of the three births, and then, instead of the imposition of hands, receives the Abuna’s consecrating breath.” The same traveller, at an interview he had with the Abuna, saw priests in chains for having clung to this proscribed doctrine. They were sentenced to several months’ successive fasts, and to fines, and were threatened, in case of repetition of the offence, with banishment and the amputation of a leg

or an arm. Whatever lessons, therefore, the Abuna may have learned in his youth in the Church Missionary Society's Schools in Cairo, toleration certainly has not been included in them. It appears that the Metropolitan cannot legally inflict corporal punishment, but that in matters of faith, and particularly on questions relating to the disputed tenet of our Lord's birth, the king regularly supports the Abuna.

We have already seen that the Abyssinian Church bears decided witness to the Catholic doctrine concerning the invocation of saints; and this, considering its total isolation, for above a millennium, from all the movement of the West, is surely an important fact. In illustration of this, let us quote the following passage from the *Æthiopian Liturgy*, taking the translation of it from Renaudot, as rendered by a Protestant authority. One reads it with a sense of indignation at the want of candour of those who persist in calling the invocation of saints "a Romish corruption." The strangeness of many of the names shows the remoteness of the communion which appeals to them, whilst their emphatic accumulation evidences the fervour with which Abyssinia holds to this article of the faith:—

O Lord, save thy people and bless thine heritage through the prayers and supplications which shall be offered in our behalf by the lady of all, the holy and pure Mary, the mother of God; through the prayers of the glorious inhabitants of heaven, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Suriel; of the four incorporeal animals, and the twenty-four priests of heaven; of S. John Baptist, of our fathers the patriarchs, apostles, the seventy-two disciples and the three children; of S. Stephen, the chief of the deacons, S. George, S. Theodorus, S. Mercurius, S. Menna, S. Philotheus, S. Basilides, the holy father Nob, and all the martyrs; of our great lord and holy father Anthony; of our holy fathers the three Macarii, our father Bichoi, John, Cyrus, and Barsoma; of our father Salama, John Kemi; our righteous father Paul; and of the holy Greek fathers, Maximus, Demetrius, Moses the holy father, and the forty martyrs; and of our father Tecla Haimanoth; of our venerable father N. our patriarch, of Claudius our king; of all the just and elect who are signed with the sign of the Cross, and of the angel of this holy day.— ("Brett on the Liturgies," p. 65).

But as for the devotion which exists in Abyssinia towards the Blessed Virgin, Protestant travellers seem to lack words by which to express their observations of its intensity. They are scandalized at perceiving that beggars rely on an appeal for charity in her name being successful, or eliciting at least a humble excuse, if not alms, when similar entreaties in the Divine name are not always responded to.

Mr. Parkyns observes that "the ordinary cry of the common street beggars in Tigré is 'Silla Izgyheyr! Silla Medhainy

Allam !' (For the sake of God ! For the sake of the Saviour !) while, if he be very importunate, he will change his usual whining note, and add with persuasive emphasis, 'Silla Mariam ! Silla Abouna Tekla Haimanout !' (For the sake of Mary ! For the sake of St. Tekla Haimanout !)." According to Tellezius one of the old Catholic sources on Abyssinia in the sixteenth century, quoted by Ludolf, when the persecution was raging against Catholics in those days, the Abyssinian cry used to be for whoever was not an enemy of Mary to take up stones and cast them at her foes. Their religion, heretical and schismatical as it was, was so bound up with this devotion that they regarded all who might make them change it as hostile to Mary ; a new charge indeed to be urged against the sons of Ignatius.

The very name, "Slave of Mary," occurs in Abyssinia as a personal designation,* reminding us of the "Servitude of Mary," which has been regarded as an invention or development peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church. In short, we cannot sufficiently impress upon the reader that the study of such a religion as that of Abyssinia is admirably calculated to convince people of the ignorance and injustice which regards as novelties introduced by Italians in the middle ages, usages and beliefs, which, in the remotest times, separatists from the Catholic Church took with them into the wilderness. At the same time, it is quite possible there may be in the Abyssinian devotions a tone of exaggeration out of harmony with the wisdom of the Catholic Church, considering that they are connected with a deeply erroneous theology concerning the Incarnation, which must necessarily colour their whole creed.

It is right to observe, before quitting this part of the subject, that the Abyssinian Church, whilst thus unequivocally invoking the prayers of the saints, also prays for them ; a practice of which primitive times also, and the Greek Church, afford examples. For instance, Ludolf quotes the following, with other similar invocations : "Remember, O Lord, the soul of thy servant our father, Tekla Haimanout, with his companions :"—though he is held in as much reverence by the Abyssinians, as S. Francis of Assisi or S. Dominic is by the Catholic Church. This fact bears much less than would appear at first sight, either on their views as to invocation, or as to the state of the departed. Little as to the former, since it does not interfere with the *cultus* of saints being one of the most prominent features of their daily life ; and little as to the latter, because they would hold it as a monstrous notion that their holy saints and princes

* It is worthy of observation that this is also the origin of the Irish and Gaelic name, *Gílmurray—Giolla-Maire*—"Servant of Mary."

are still expiating sins in purgatory. They explain those prayers by the observation that we continually pray for many things we know that God Almighty has already granted. We might also add, that it is quite conceivable many prayers might be understood in a Catholic sense, viz., as supplication for the increase of the accidental glory of the saints, supposed of course to be in possession of the beatific vision. As to purgatory, if Ludolf's statements are correct, their ideas are vague, some holding that there are but two places of the departed, heaven and hell, others—which is the more common opinion—that there is a third place, where souls are detained, not enjoying the beatific vision before the resurrection. Be this as it may, it is certain that they offer mass for the dead, in the case of wealthy persons, daily for forty days after death; for others, five masses during the same space of time, on the 3rd, 7th, 12th, 30th, and 40th days; and for all, yearly, on the anniversary of their death.*

The baptismal ceremonies of the Abyssinians, whilst in part of a dubious character, abound in interesting traces of the primitive ritual. Before entering the church, the 51st Psalm is read, and the catechumen twice receives an unction. There is also an imposition of hands, and an abjuration, in which the catechumen raises his right hand, turns to the west, and abjures Satan. Turning to the east, he declares his belief in the Nicene Creed, which the priest repeats. Passages from St. John, the Acts, and the Pauline epistles are read; oil is poured crosswise into the baptismal water, the catechumen is then led by the deacon into the pool, and is immersed by the priest; the latter using, according to Ludolf, who refers to Alvarez, the regular Catholic form of words. But he also admits that Jesuit missionaries stated there was very considerable variation in the words employed. Sometimes it was, "I baptize thee in the name of the Holy Trinity;" sometimes, "in the name of Christ;" or, "in the name of the Holy Ghost;" or, "in the water of Jordan." Or, "May God baptize thee!" or, "May God wash thee!" and the like. This was the principal reason for the conditional reiteration of baptism, which gave profound offence to the Abyssinians. After the immersion, the neophyte is received by the sponsors, is clad in a white garment, and led into the church. He then receives the holy communion, after which milk and honey are given him. The ceremonies are closed by the imposition of hands, and the blessing, "Go in peace,

* Some very interesting remarks bearing closely on the line of argument in the text, will be found in a recent number of this *REVIEW*.—See vol. li. pp. 139—143.

sons of baptism." The foregoing is a description of adult baptism, which, in Ludolf's time at least, in consequence of conversions from the surrounding heathen, was not unfrequent. Infants are held in the sponsor's arms and receive baptism by sprinkling and ablution in the porch. Males used not to be baptized before the fortieth day after birth, females after the eightieth. It was also, and probably is still, the Æthiopian custom to administer to infants at baptism a drop from the chalice, in a spoon, together with a particle of the Host.

We may here notice a singular custom in the Abyssinian ritual. On the 11th January of the Æthiopic year, answering to the 6th of ours, they celebrate the feast of Epiphany, which in their calendar is called "the Baptism of Christ." It will be remembered that in the Catholic Church the gospel containing the testimony of S. John is read on the octave of the Epiphany; and with the Abyssinians, the celebration of the Epiphany appears to be associated with, or to mean the commemoration of, the baptism of our Lord by S. John, in the river Jordan. The eve of the feast is observed by ecclesiastics and the devout as a strict fast; in the afternoon, they receive the Holy Eucharist, and in the evening a procession is made with the holy arks, or *tabots*, under canopies, to the nearest stream, on the banks of which tents have been erected, and the whole population, old and young, is assembled. The night is spent in chanting hymns and psalms; and before dawn, the people bathe in the stream, the water of which has been previously blessed by the priests. The old Jesuit writers stated that this ceremonial was characterized by an utter disregard to decency, in which one recent and important authority, Major Harris, abundantly confirms them. At the same time, Bruce, as reliable a witness as the latter, denies these gross disorders, and disputes them on antecedent grounds, connected with the customs of Abyssinia, and also because the Abuna, bred up in the desert of S. Macarius, could not sanction proceedings of this kind. Mr. Parkyns does not notice any such abuses. It is very possible, in so large a country as Abyssinia, the usage might differ in different provinces. What appears very certain is, that drunkenness prevails to a disgraceful extent. But the reason for which at present we advert to the ceremony is controversial. They call this festival *temkat*, i.e., baptism, and the old Catholic missionaries appear to have thought that it was regarded not as a mere lustration, but as a repetition of baptism, properly so called. We are not prepared to say that this was the case; but the following statement of Major Harris, however broadly expressed, is quite enough to show that the ceremony has relations to doctrine of an erroneous kind, more

especially when we place it in connection with the tendencies shown by the Abyssinian dogma of the third birth, in one of its forms :—

He who neglects to undergo the annual purification enjoined on this day by the Æthiopic Church, is considered to carry with him the burden of every sin committed during the preceding twelve months, and to be surely visited by sickness and misfortune ; whereas those who perform the rite are believed to have emerged thoroughly cleansed and regenerated. (Harris's "Highlands of Æthiopia," vol. iii. p. 200.)

As to the sacrament of penance, the views of the Abyssinian Church appear to be vague. Confession is said not to be exacted until after the age of twenty-five, and then to be only of a general character, expressed by the words, "I have sinned, I have sinned," unless in the case of three greater crimes,—homicide, adultery, and theft ; with which exceptions, the early Catholic missionaries had great difficulty in inducing their converts to confess anything, naming the offence. Where these or other grievous sins have been committed, it is customary, as we have said, to confess to the Abuna in person, who assigns penances in proportion to the magnitude of the offence,—fasting or stripes, the latter being forthwith administered by his attendants. The severity displayed in one instance we have met with, where a penitent who confessed the habitual commission of incest, and was sentenced to a life-long fast, reminds one of the rigid satisfaction demanded by the early Church. The seal of confession is not part of the Abyssinian law of penance, according to Ludolf, but Major Harris contradicts this ; it certainly would hardly apply to the loose method we have described in the lesser offences, and the greater seem, in some cases at least, to be confessed in public. We find, as a prevailing feature of Abyssinian theology and practice, an absence of fixity, which resembles some of the characteristics of Anglicanism. As to sacraments in general, according to Ludolf, they assign no definite number to them, and the same writer states that confirmation and extreme unction are unknown in the Abyssinian Church, as to which it seems certain that he must have been misinformed, since the Coptic Church, with which the Abyssinian is in the closest connection, possesses those sacraments. As to marriage, the habits of the Abyssinians are of the most irregular kind. Concubinage, by which we mean so-called civil marriages, not binding beyond the will of the parties, may be said to be the rule, and marriages in the face of the Church the exception, scarce one in a hundred demanding them. The former are celebrated as regular marriages, with the festivities appointed by national custom,

assemblages of the families, cavalcade of bridesmen, introduction of the bride with tapers, mutual declaration of marriage, and an agreement as to the property brought by each,—the husband promising a stipulated number of cows and *shamas*, the father-in-law usually bestowing arms and household furniture. A priest may or may not be present to give an admonition, but the ceremony is not considered to have any religious character, and the alliance may be dissolved on the shortest notice and for the most trifling reasons. A second marriage is then permitted, but in that case the husband, whilst still probably living in perfect friendship with the woman from whom he separates, and even maintaining her in a neighbouring house, no longer treats her as his wife. It may often happen that these civil marriages end in a lasting attachment, and then the parties seek for the sanction of the Church. The religious marriage appears to consist principally in the reception of the holy communion, from which, as Ludolf was told, those who have more wives than one are excluded; and the tie thus made is indissoluble. We do not find that polygamy, except in the sense we have explained, is prevalent, unless in the case of the sovereign, who has, or at least had in former times, hundreds of concubines. Probably the same practice may prevail with the great chiefs. One remarkable rule obtained with the king of Abyssinia. He was regarded as bound by the same matrimonial laws that priests are subjected to, and could not marry a second wife. At the suggestion of a late Anglo-Abyssinian chief, Mr. Bell, whom most recent travellers in the country mention, the present king, Theodorus, has broken this rule. His first wife having died, he has, in defiance of the law of his religion, married another wife, and this step was sanctioned by the Abuna, who administered the holy communion to the pair shortly afterwards. The king is said to be using his influence to restrain the practice of concubinage, and one of the latest travellers states that many chiefs have latterly followed the royal example in this respect.

We now come to the important subject of the rite for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the Abyssinian Church. In the first place it may be remarked that their public worship means assisting at mass only. There are no sermons, or very rarely, but passages from the New Testament are read, in *Æthiopic*. The construction of the churches is very peculiar, but we shall have a better opportunity of describing it when we come to examine the affinity of the Abyssinian Church to Judaism. For the present we have only to state that in the Holy of Holies there is a table, resting on four pillars, and over it the *tabot* or ark, to which extreme reverence

is attached, and upon this are placed the paten and chalice. All are allowed to partake of the chalice, and in its administration a spoon is used, terminating in a cross. The wine used by the Abyssinian Church for the altar is of a sort that can scarcely be called wine at all. It is merely the juice expressed from dried raisins that have been steeped in water, and appears not to have undergone the process of fermentation. Indeed, Bruce describes it as a thick fluid, more resembling marmalade. Others give an opposite account, and say that it may be considered as simply water. At any rate it can, generally speaking, only be wine in name, so that, so far as it is concerned, the question as to the validity of their consecration is superfluous. The eucharistic bread is prepared with much mystery by the deacons, in a small building called the Bethlehem, adjoining each church. It is leavened (so Ludolf, after Tellezius, but Bruce says the contrary), except on Holy Thursday, and is stamped with a S. Andrew's Cross. The reception of the Holy Communion is said to be barbarous and disgusting in its manner. It is part of the Abyssinian notions of high breeding to eat in a gormandizing way, in large mouthfuls and with much noise; and the great men are permitted to practise this habit, even at the altar, in a way which is not only shocking but difficult to reconcile with that belief in the Real Presence which the Abyssinian formularies certainly inculcate. We do not, however, suppose that these poor people intend any irreverence. Communicants are very few in number, chiefly children, ecclesiastics, and married people who have received the sanction of the Church for their union, and who, as we have seen, form very far the minority of those regarded as living in matrimony. Gifts are offered by some at the celebration of the Eucharist, such as bread, oil, first-fruits, and tithes. In large churches, and on high festivals, four or five ecclesiastics are required, a priest, "sub-priest," deacon, and sub-deacon. The ceremonial is described as abounding in that clash and clang of rude instruments which might be expected among semi-civilized people like the Abyssinians.

The Æthiopian liturgy, or canon of the mass, though bearing a general resemblance to that of S. Basil (used in the Patriarchate of Alexandria), is on the whole a distinct composition. It begins with some prayers addressed through the mediation of the saints, in particular the evangelists, apostles, the 500 brethren, and 318 orthodox, that is, the fathers of the council of Nice. This passage bears a great affinity to the introduction of the Roman canon of the mass. Then there are prayers for the patriarch, the celebrant, the king, and all in necessity; for the departed in the faith, for those who take care

of the incense, the oblations, the sacred veils, books, and vessels. Other prayers follow through the mediation of saints, which we have already quoted, and some versicles and responses of a sublime, Oriental character. The prayer of consecration we transcribe as follows :—

[*Here the priest shall lay his hands upon the censer, and then extend them over the oblation.*]

People.—According to Thy mercy, O God, and not according to our iniquities. [*And this is said thrice.*]

Priest.—He extended His hands at His passion ; He suffered, that He might release those from sufferings who trust in Thee ; of His own free will He delivered Himself up to suffer that He might destroy death, break the bonds of Satan, and trample upon hell ; that He might establish His testament, and manifest His resurrection. In the same night in which He was betrayed He took bread into His holy, blessed, and immaculate hands ; He looked up to heaven, to Thee His Father ; He gave thanks, He blessed, He sanctified it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat ye all of this ; this bread is my Body, which is broken for you for the remission of sins. *Amen.*

People.—Amen, Amen, Amen. We believe and are certain ; we praise thee, O Lord our God ; this is truly Thy Body, and so we believe.

Priest.—Likewise also He blessed and sanctified the cup of thanksgiving, and said to them, Take, drink ye all of this ; this is the cup of my Blood, which shall be shed for you, for the redemption of many. *Amen.*

People.—Amen. This is truly Thy Blood, and we believe it.

Priest.—And as often as ye do this, ye shall do it in remembrance of Me.

People.—We show forth Thy death, O Lord ; we believe Thy holy resurrection, Thy ascension, and second coming ; we beseech Thee, O Lord our God ; we believe this to be true.

Prayers follow at the breaking of the Host ; then there is an absolution, commencing with a reference to the promise made to S. Peter concerning the rock, and keys of the kingdom of heaven. After this communion is received as follows :—

Priest.—The holy, precious, living, and true Body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which is given for the remission of sins and eternal life to all who receive it with faith. *Amen.* The holy, precious, life-giving, and true Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which is given for the remission of sins, and to eternal life to all who receive it with faith. *Amen.* This is, in truth, the Body and Blood of Emmanuel. *Amen.* I believe, I believe, I believe, from this time forth, now, and for evermore. *Amen.* This is the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which He received of the Lady of us all, the holy and pure Virgin Mary, and made it one with His Divinity, without any commixture or confusion, any division or alteration of the Divinity. He witnessed a good confession in the days of Pontius Pilate, and of His own free will delivered Himself up for us upon the wood of the holy Cross. *Amen.* I believe, I believe, I believe, that this

Divinity was not separated from His humanity ; no, not for an hour, or so much as the twinkling of an eye : He delivered Himself up for us, and purchased salvation, remission of sins, and eternal life, for all who receive Him by faith. *Amen.* I believe, I believe, I believe, from this time forth, now and for evermore. *Amen.*

In communicating the people, the priest says, "This is the bread of life, which came down from heaven, the truly precious body of Emmanuel our God." And similarly with the chalice : "This is the cup of life, which came down from heaven, the precious blood of Christ."

Previous to the reception, the sub-deacon pours water into the hands of the communicant, with which he washes his mouth, and then receives. Censers are meanwhile waving in the Holy of Holies, where, at this part of the service (according to Mr. Stern), the priests wash their hands. He says also that the heads and garments of the communicants are sprinkled, whilst the priest utters these words :—

If you think that I have now cleansed your garments and purified your bodies, and yet continue to cherish hatred and malice in your heart, I tell you that the body of Christ will prove to be a burning fire to consume you, and His blood a bottomless sea to drown you !

We do not find these words in the *Æthiopian Liturgy*, but they bear some resemblance to a passage which occurs in this part of the Mass in one of the *Coptic Liturgies*, where the celebrant, turning to the people with the Holy Sacrament, says :—

Behold the bread of the saints ! Let him who is free from sin approach. But let him who is stained with sin retire, lest God strike him with his lightning ; for me, I wash my hands of his sin.*

Before quitting the church, each communicant, to prevent desecration, drinks a cup of water. (This resembles a custom we have witnessed in Catholic churches in Bavaria, where the communicant, immediately after he has received, drinks a small quantity of wine, as he kneels at the rails.) During the day they abstain from expectorating.

We suppose no unprejudiced person could question the proposition that this ritual, simply understood, conveys the doctrine of transubstantiation. If that doctrine is not held by the Abyssinian Church, words are used on the most solemn occasions which are only calculated to mislead, supposing them to be taken in their plain and natural sense. There appears, however, a difference of opinion on this subject. Ludolf, from

* See DUBLIN REVIEW for June, 1850, *art.* "The Coptic Church."

the information of his friend, Abba Gregorius, disputes their belief on this head. The latter seems, when his attention was invited to the words of the Liturgy, to have talked like an Anglican, to have said it was a mystery, to have admitted a Real Presence, but to have denied transubstantiation. This is certainly not conclusive, when we recollect how close to Protestantism so high a dignitary as the Abuna in the present day can be, who did not learn his views in Æthiopia. According to Mr. Parkyns, "some, but not all, of the Abyssinians believe in the transubstantiation of sacramental bread and wine, and assert that the actual body and blood of our Saviour are partaken of by the faithful, but that an angel takes them away from an unbeliever, and restores the bread and wine, in his hands, to their natural state, such as they were previous to the benediction." With this Mr. Stern's view nearly agrees. He relates, however, a legend from the Abyssinian authorized treatise, called *Haimanout Mysteer*, or "Mysteries of the Faith," which could have been found in no country except one where transubstantiation was a prevailing belief, and with which, in some form or other, all are familiar in Catholic books of pious reading on the Holy Sacrifice. There was a monk who doubted of transubstantiation, or, as Mr. Stern calls it, "the material presence." Two of his brethren retired to a holy desert to pray for him, after obtaining a delay of punishment for a week. "On the day of their return, whilst they were devoutly performing mass in the convent church, behold the bread, in the act of consecration, suddenly changed into a beautiful infant, which a radiant and resplendent angel, bearing the sword of divine justice, sacrificed and carried up to heaven. The heretical monk who saw the miracle became henceforth a most zealous and devout advocate of transubstantiation." Mr. Stern adds, "the erudite reject the legend, and in their sentiments approximate to the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation." Whether this be the case or not, the evidence of the Liturgy of the Æthiopian Church as to its primitive doctrine on this head, and of such a legend as the foregoing, in a symbolical work, as to the manner in which the doctrine was understood, is quite enough to afford an important testimony in favour of the Catholic belief.

We proceed to consider a particular characteristic of the Abyssinian schism, which, however it has been attempted to explain it away in certain details, is far too decided not to be regarded as one of its most striking features. This is its approximation in various points to Judaism. Take first the material arrangement of their churches. These buildings are of a barbarous appearance, circular in form, with a conical thatch surmounted by an iron cross and adorned with ostrich

eggs. On entering, it is observed that just as the Jewish temple was divided into three compartments—the court of the people, the court of the priests, and the Holy of Holies,—so an Abyssinian church is divided into three parts. The first, called *Kene Máhelet*, running all round the building, is divided from the second by a circular wall, concentric with the outer one. Beyond this wall the laity may not pass, except to receive holy communion. All entrance into the church is denied to pagans. The exterior face of this wall of separation is adorned with paintings of the saints, S. Michael, S. George, the B. Virgin, &c., with other religious emblems, the rudeness of all which provokes the sneer of the Protestant traveller. In the second compartment, called *Makdas*, appropriated to priests, the religious services take place. Here are suspended in cotton bags round the walls the bones of deceased worthies, until they can be transported by the nearest relative to the sacred shrine of Debra Libanos, where are entombed the relics of Tekla Haimanout. The third compartment is the Holy of Holies, or *Kedàs Kedisen*. Into this, Major Harris says that only the Alaka is admitted. We presume he means that no layman but the Alaka can be admitted. Behind the veil of this division the consecration of the elements takes place, the vessels of the altar are deposited, and the *tabot*, or ark, to which we have already referred, is placed under a silken canopy. This ark, which is not like our tabernacles, corresponds to the Jewish ark of the covenant, and is an object of the profoundest veneration. It is a wooden box, the size, form, and material of which are exactly prescribed by the canons of the Abyssinian Church. It must be $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet long by 1 foot broad, and 4 inches deep, having a large cross in the middle, and twelve smaller ones, to represent Christ and his Apostles. It is anointed and christened by the Abuna in the name of some saint or angel, and is said to contain a scroll on which is written the name of the patron saint of the church. According to Major Harris, they make vows and oblations to the *tabot*, each individual selecting one for his special veneration. All prostrate themselves as it is carried in procession, and when it is replaced in the Holy of Holies the priests loudly exclaim, “The temple of the Eternal God!” Here there is evidently a superstition based on Judaism. But this is by no means all. The various disqualifications of the Levitical code forbid entrance into the church. If a man has entered a room where a child has been recently born, he is unclean. The same is the case if he has touched polluted garments, and many similar prohibitions exist, which require purification. Circumcision is universally practised. Abstinence also from the kinds of meat forbidden by the Jewish law is a rule among Abyssi-

nians. Thus they refuse to eat animals which chew the cud but do not divide the hoof, and abstain from swine's flesh, and from the sinew which shrank (Gen. xxxii. 35). Indeed this scrupulosity is carried by some beyond the Jewish law. There are particular families in Abyssinia who will not eat of certain clean animals, or of certain parts of any animal—for instance, the tongue or the heart—because some ancestor of theirs had made a vow on the subject; and all animals killed for food must be killed in a particular time, with the head turned towards Jerusalem, and the invocation of the B. Trinity used when the knife is passed across the throat. To these points of resemblance may be added, besides some instances already mentioned (as the existence of the class of *debterahs*, or scribes, and the permission of polygamy), the practice of dancing in their religious ceremonies, which, though not absolutely unknown in the Catholic Church (it occurs, we believe, in some functions in Spanish churches), is so common in Abyssinia as that Major Harris styles it the chief point of their worship. We see in it a trace of the dancing of David before the ark; but, as may be supposed, it has degenerated into something very wild and uncouth. Abstinence from servile labour on Saturdays is another trace of Judaism. Among their civil usages we find one that bears a great affinity to the Jewish law concerning cities of refuge. Asylum is permitted to homicides in churches, which of course might be illustrated from mediæval times in Europe. But the fugitive is permitted to retreat into another province, and boundaries are fixed beyond which the pursuer may not go—the Taccazy between Tigré and Amhara, and the Abai between Shoa and Gojam. Certain towns are also named where the criminal will be safe, as Axum, Waldubbe, Gundigundi, Debra Damo, Debra Abai. In the principal Abyssinian law-book, to which we shall presently refer, the Jewish *lex talionis*, “an eye for an eye,” &c., is enacted, but whether it is enforced we have not been able to discover.

It is true that the Abyssinians themselves have denied, as to some of these usages, that they are practised in a Jewish sense. Thus the confession of Claudius (one of their kings at the time of the Portuguese connection with Abyssinia) attributes the Abyssinian circumcision to merely human reasons; and the Abba Gregorius denied the lawfulness of polygamy, except that it was unpunished by the civil magistrate, and compared the abstinence of his countrymen from swine's flesh to that of Europeans from horse-flesh. But making all allowance for these excuses, the fact is evident that there reigns throughout the Abyssinian religion a general and unmistakable resemblance to Judaism.

The Abyssinian calendar would form a curious study of itself. We can only here indicate some of the more characteristic features. We find in it also traces of the Judaizing spirit. On the 28th day of every month are commemorated Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and others of the holy men of the Old Testament have also their feast-days, as Enoch, Job, Samuel, Elias, Jeremias, &c., &c. A great devotion is evinced to S. Michael, who is honoured on the 12th day of every month. This repetition is frequent in the calendar. The nativity of our Lord is assigned to the 29th day of every month. "The conception of S. Mary" belongs to the 16th December, answering to the 12th in the Julian calendar; the circumcision of Christ to January 6th (1st); but their year commences with September. "Birthday of Our Lady Mary," September 10th. "Mary the Holy Virgin" occurs in some day of every month, usually the 21st. "The death of Our Lady Mary" is celebrated on the 21st January (16th). "The ascension of the body of the Holy Virgin," on the 16th August (9th August). "Peter the Apostle," on August 7th (July 31st). "Peter and Paul," on July 5th (June 29th), and again on the 14th of the same month. Alexandrian patriarchs, as may be supposed, often occur, and crowds of other Alexandrian, Greek, or Æthiopian saints, whose names have never reached the West. On the other hand, a Western name hardly ever appears. We notice the name of "Liberius, Patriarch of Rome," on October 9th. The 318 bishops of Nice, the 200 bishops of Ephesus, the 150 bishops of Constantinople, are collectively honoured, each on days appropriated to those respective councils. One of the greatest Abyssinian festivals is that of Epiphany, which we have already described. Among the others which are observed with the greatest devotion is the day which follows it, January 12th (7th), when they commemorate the nuptials of Cana in Galilee, and also honour S. Michael the Archangel. "The Feast of the Glorious Cross" (called Mascal) is the one celebrated with the greatest pomp, and on it the custom prevails of lighting great fires, like the old Western practice on Midsummer-eve. It is painful to add, that in connection with this festival we have once more to remark a very decided instance of the Judaizing character of the Abyssinian Church, if it is not rather a remnant of paganism. Oxen are led three times round the bonfires, slaughtered, and left as a prey to the wild animals. It is also common for individuals to make vows to slaughter on the anniversary of their patron saints a bullock, a sheep, or the like, in order to conciliate his favours for the rest of the year. Families as well as individuals have their patron saints, whose anniversary is handed down from father to son as the family

jubilee. The most favourite patrons are St. Michael, the Blessed Virgin, John the Baptist; and among the Abyssinian saints Tekla Haimanout, and Gabra Menfos Kouddos. (The latter name signifies "Slave of the Holy Spirit.") Major Harris says, "S. Michael and the Holy Virgin are here venerated as in no other country in the world—the former as the martial leader of all the choirs of angels, the latter as chief of all saints and queen of heaven and earth, and both are considered as the great intercessors for mankind" (vol. iii. p. 151).

The fasts in the Abyssinian Church are very numerous and very severe. Their Lent lasts fifty-five days; their Advent fast the last ten days of October and the whole of November; "the fast of the Apostles," from ten to forty days; "the fast of the Holy Virgin," sixteen days; "the fast of Jonas," three days; besides the Wednesdays and Fridays. They require altogether nearly two hundred and sixty days of fasting throughout the year, and it appears that they are pretty faithfully observed. Their custom does not permit eating on fast-days till late in the afternoon, except on Saturdays and Sundays in the long fasts, and their diet is unpalatable, consisting of dried peas or spinach, with a vegetable oil of disagreeable taste. They have a very singular rule for determining the time of day when they may eat in ordinary fasting-time. It is regulated by the length of a man's shadow, measured by his own feet. Thus, in Advent, during each day, a man does not eat until his shadow measures nine and a half feet. During Good Friday and Holy Saturday, the priests and rigidly devout eat nothing whatever, but fast absolutely for forty-eight hours. As to the Lent fast, we have again to notice a Jewish practice. They scrupulously cleanse and polish all the culinary utensils, that no particle of meat or prohibited food may remain upon them.

It may be said that, on the whole, and notwithstanding the many highly interesting points of contact between it and Catholicism, the Abyssinian schism presents, in a remarkable manner, the aspect of a *corrupt* Church. The phrase is applied falsely by Protestants to the Catholic Church, with her majestic organization, her firm and complete possession of truth, losing nothing, adding nothing, but handing down from age to age all she has received, fortified, as may be needed, against the ever-varied assaults of heresy, and only more fully and harmoniously exhibited as time proceeds. But in Abyssinia, whilst, as it were by accident, certain great truths and salutary practices have been retained, some have been placed in extravagant and disproportionate prominence, others have been lost or are denied, a whole brood of dubious or un-Christian practices have

been adopted from Judaism, and doctrine has pullulated with a sort of vermiculate growth into strange forms. Side by side with a cruel rigorism in some things, we observe elsewhere a licence which the pure morality of the Catholic Church would not tolerate for an instant.

Hence, we are not surprised that in the Abyssinian as in the Greek schism there exists a bitter hostility to the Catholic Church, that all the influence of the Abuna is exerted to keep Catholic missionaries out of the country, whilst, on the other hand, he favours and encourages the settlement of Protestants. We may be certain that his instinct does not deceive him, and that let the saint-worship of the Abyssinians be as unbounded as they please, the law laid down by De Maistre will be strictly verified—*Toute église schismatique est Protestante*. It is very certain, however, that there are also many in Abyssinia who desire to be united with the Holy See. For a short time, the efforts of the Jesuit missionaries in the seventeenth century obtained a public reconciliation by the royal authority; and although this was swept away by lamentable convulsions, the seed has never been lost. It may here be interesting to place before the reader the grounds upon which the Abyssinian schismatics endeavour to justify their estrangement from the Holy See. The following abstract of them is supplied in the letter already quoted from a native Abyssinian Catholic. He says:—

Among the other objections commonly alleged by the schismatical writers in their ecclesiastical history, and of which they offer solutions, are the following, literally quoted. Whether the Roman Church, the see of Peter, is greater than other churches, from the fact that Christ said to him, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church?" Again, whether Christ put forth these words because of the Roman Church alone, or rather because of the universal Church, which is from the beginning unto the end, one and not manifold? They reply, We know not how one is greater than another, one inferior and another superior. For it is not after the manner of the synagogue of Jerusalem, which was greater than other synagogues, in which they neither sacrificed nor adored; it is not so, but as Christ is one, so the Church is one, which He gained by His blood. Wherefore the fathers of the second œcumenical council taught in these words: We believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,—be it observed, they did not say in two, but in one. Accordingly, if it is true that the Roman is greater than other churches, we ought to say, we believe in greater and lesser churches. God forbid. As you divide Christ into two natures, do you so divide His Church? Christ is one, and the Church is one, and we believe in one.*

* Schismatici scriptores in eorum historiâ ecclesiasticâ, inter cæteras objectiones quas passim afferre solent, atque ab ipsis solvi, ad litteram sic habent.

As if the body did not derive unity from the head, or as if the removal of the head would not at once destroy unity in the whole body, and disintegrate all its elements. It is noticeable also how their deep-rooted heresy about the divine and human natures appears where you would scarcely expect it—in a dispute on the supremacy of the Chair of Peter. It is, nevertheless, very curious that one of the Abyssinian church books, called “The Court of Emperors” [so styled by our native authority above mentioned, who means, we presume, the *Fathe Negest*, “The King’s Court, or Book of Laws,” in Krapf’s catalogue of Abyssinian literature], ascribed to the fathers of the Council of Nice, and said to have been given by them to the emperor Constantine, contains testimony of the strongest kind to the supremacy of the Holy See, declaring the necessity of four patriarchs from the analogy of the four Gospels, the four rivers of Paradise, the four seasons, winds and elements, and that the head and judge among those four patriarchs is the bishop of the Roman See, even as Peter, to whom was given power over all the princes and congregations of Christians. We do not refer to this by way of laying stress on the passage in itself, because the name “patriarch” shows that it must be taken from the apocryphal canons of the Council of Nice. But it is singular that it should occur in a book held in veneration by the Abyssinians, as the writer states, beyond any other book, perhaps not excepting, so to speak, the Gospel itself. He exclaims, humorously, “Woe to him that contradicts it! They would flay him alive like S. Bartholomew.” When this passage is cited against the Abyssinian divines, they say, “We have been long separated, and custom has the force of law.” When one goes on to question them, he says that they play with words, and talk irrelevantly, *canunt extra chorum*. A Catholic missionary, the Rev. F. Leon des Avanchers, writes, in 1850,

Utrum major sit ecclesia Romana, Petri sedes, aliis ecclesiis, ex eo quod Christus ei dixerit, Tu es Petrus, et supra hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam? Rursus, num Christus protulit hæc verba propter solam ecclesiam Romanam, an vero propter universam ecclesiam, quæ est a fine usque ad finem, una et non multiplex? Respondent, Nescimus quomodo una major sit alterâ, una inferior et altera superior. Non est enim quemadmodum synagoga Jerusalem, quæ fuit major aliis synagogis, in quibus nec sacrificabant nec adorabant, non est sic, sed sicut unus est Christus, ita ecclesia una, quam acquisivit suo sanguine. Propterea patres secundi concilii œcumenici docuerunt his verbis:—Credimus in unam sanctam ecclesiam catholicam et apostolicam,—notandum, non dixere in duas sed in unam. Itaque, si verum est Romanam esse majorem aliis, nos dicere debemus, credimus in majores et minores ecclesias. Absit. Num sicut Christum in duas naturas dividitis, ita ecclesiam ejus? Unus est Christus, et una ecclesia, et nos credimus in unam.

“Although the Christians of Abyssinia profess the error of Dioscorus, a great number of them live in utter ignorance of the matter, and think that their bishop, or the Abuna, sent to them by the schismatic patriarch of Cairo, is in communication with the pope.” *

In fact, the extreme impatience shown by the Abuna of the action of Catholic missionaries in the country, their recent expulsion, and the severe persecution sustained by those who hold to them, clearly show that a powerful movement exists in that direction. We find that, in 1849, while Mgr. de Jacobis received episcopal consecration as bishop of Nilopolis, and by an extraordinary exception passed over from the Latin to the Ethiopian, Monsignor Massaia, V.A. of the Gallas, ordained at the same time twenty-five native priests. About the same time, Teclafa, the superior of one thousand monks, was converted, with his whole monastery, to the Catholic Church, and afterwards formed three congregations in the true fold. Some years previously, in 1842, Krapf, the Protestant missionary, speaks of Ubie, the chief of Tigré, as “working so strenuously in the interests of Rome, that the Abuna could not prevail upon the prince to cherish the Abyssinian Church to which he belonged.” For the moment, no doubt, the prospects of Catholicism in this country are under a cloud, in spite of the truly apostolic labours and sufferings of the excellent Mgr. de Jacobis, to whose virtues the Protestant traveller Parkyns renders a generous tribute. The strong and newly constituted ruler of Abyssinia backs the Abuna in his hostility to the Catholic faith, and as the good Abyssinian priest, to whom we have been indebted for so much curious information, writes (on Oct. 8th, 1853), “they are both of the same lump (*della stessa furina*) and purpose, the one in religion, and the other in government, to have the world *sub ditione unâ*. But let us hope after the tempest will succeed a calm.” In this aspiration we heartily unite; and, improbable as it is that these words will ever make their way to those distant regions, we should be glad to imagine that the Abyssinian Catholics, pining in dungeons under a rude tyranny, yet preserving the flame of pure religion burning in their bosoms, could know that they have the deep sympathy and fervent prayers of many widely removed from them in blood and in all earthly associations, yet indissolubly one with them in the faith of Christ and the communion of His vicar upon earth.

* “Annals of the Propagation of the Faith,” vol. xiv. p. 370. For many interesting details relating to Catholic missions in Abyssinia, see Marshall’s “Christian Missions,” vol. ii. ch. vii.

ART. III.—INTRINSIC END OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Du Spirituel et du Temporel dans l'Eglise. Lettre de Monseigneur [Parisis] l'Evêque d'Arras à Son Excellence M. Thouvenel. Paris, 1860.

"A RECIPROCAL benefit," says M. Thouvenel, as quoted in this most telling little work—"a reciprocal benefit has irrevocably accrued to modern societies in the separation which has been accomplished in the two domains of the religious and political order." The expression, indeed, in itself is somewhat vague; but, as used by M. Thouvenel and other politicians of his school, it has a most definite and intelligible meaning. "The State, as such, has no religion; has no concern with revelation; nor any obligation of listening to the Church's voice: political science is wholly independent of theological." There is no principle which the revolutionary party throughout Europe regards as more fundamental than this; and there is none which more gives to that party its distinctive character.*

On the other hand, if we would know what judgment has been pronounced on this principle by the highest earthly authority, let us study the allocution delivered by the reigning Pontiff in June, 1862. In that allocution, the Holy Father describes at some length the tenets of those evil men who are now banded together against every high and holy interest. And what is it which he places at the very head of those errors? "They blush not," he says, "to assert that the knowledge of philosophical and moral truth, and also *that the laws of a nation*, may and ought to withdraw themselves from [the jurisdiction of] Divine revelation and the Church's authority." † "That philosophical and moral study should be independent of the Church's authority:" here is rationalism. "That a nation's laws should be thus independent:" here is revo-

* Après avoir d'âge en âge triomphé successivement des sanglantes persécutions du glaive, des sophismes acharnés de l'hérésie, et de l'effroyable dépravation de ses propres enfans, l'Eglise s'est trouvé en présence d'un ennemi nouveau qu'on peut appeler la politique des gouvernemens. Cette politique . . . c'était au fond la cause des intérêts matériels et de l'orgueil humain luttant contre l'intérêt des âmes et le règne de Dieu.—*De l'Eglise et l'Etat*, par Mgr. Parisis, p. 4.

† Haud erubescunt asserere philosophicarum rerum morumque scientiam, itemque civiles leges, posse et debere à Divinâ revelatione et ecclesiæ auctoritate declinare.

lutionism. What rationalism is in the intellectual order, that is revolutionism in the political; and from these two poisonous sources flows forth that pestilential stream of speculation and action which is the misery of our time. The Catholic reviewer, then, can have no more important duty than to grapple with this two-headed hydra; and it is under a sense of that duty that we propose, in our present article, to investigate the nature and extent of a State's legitimate functions in promoting the spiritual welfare of its members. Our task is rendered more delicate, but at the same time more important, by the circumstance that we are not acquainted with any modern Catholic work which occupies this precise ground; and both the delicacy and the importance of our undertaking are still further increased by two great difficulties which meet us at the very outset.

The first of these difficulties is the danger of an opposite and still worse extreme. Detestable as is the doctrine that a civil governor (as such) has no concern with Divine revelation and the Church's voice, the doctrine is still more detestable that he possesses supreme authority in spirituals; and we must watch therefore carefully, lest, in contending against political atheism, we give any kind of colour to a tyrannical and usurping Erastianism. It might be thought, indeed, on the first blush, that all our danger from revolutionists is on the side of licence; but the most cursory survey of facts will teach us better. They begin, no doubt, with laying down, as a broad axiom, that the spiritual and political can never clash: they are obliged to do so, for the purpose of maintaining that the Church has no right to interfere with what they call the proper work of the State. But having affirmed this proposition in general, they proceed to deny it in every particular instance: they discern always and everywhere some (supposed) political consequences in the Church's most purely spiritual action. Having started, then, by inferring from one premiss that the Church has no right of interfering with the "proper office of the State," they end by inferring, from precisely the opposite premiss, that the State has a full right of interfering, and that almost in every detail, with the proper office of the Church. And, accordingly, the Holy Father, in the very passage from which we have just quoted, after having censured their licence, proceeds to censure their usurpation and tyranny.* Indeed, it is surely no exag-

* *Hinc perversè comminiscuntur, civilem potestatem posse se immiscere rebus quæ ad religionem, mores, et regimen spirituale pertinent; atque etiam impedire, quominus sacrorum antistites et fideles populi, cum Romano Pontifice, supremo totius ecclesiæ pastore divinitus constituto, liberè communicent, &c.*

geration to say that their tyranny is in principle far more monstrous even than that of our Henry VIII. or James I. ; against which latter Suarez felt himself called on so vigorously to protest. Henry VIII., in claiming spiritual dominion, at least claimed it as God's vicegerent, as entrusted by Him with the care of his people's eternal welfare. But these men are avowedly endeavouring that purely secular considerations may reign supreme ; that the spiritual may be sacrificed to the material, and the eternal to the temporal.

This, then, is the first difficulty which meets us : the necessity of avoiding Scylla no less than Charybdis, and the great need for accuracy of vision in discerning the true middle course. Our second difficulty is hardly less serious, but of a totally different kind. Certain very eminent theologians, of whom Suarez may be taken as a representative instance, seem, on the surface, to maintain an opinion tending at least to the error which we combat ; the opinion, namely, that civil government, as such, is exceeding its prescribed limits if it labour to promote directly spiritual good. We are perfectly certain, indeed, that these theologians not only are not inclined, but are in the extremest degree opposed, to any such opinion ; and it will be one object of this article to vindicate our conviction on this head. Still it cannot be denied that certain expressions used by them may be plausibly alleged against us ; and we cannot be surprised, therefore, that certain Catholic writers of the present day, and writers who justly claim our deep respect and admiration, occasionally use expressions which we regret. These writers, indeed, fully admit that no civil law can be binding on the conscience which is contrary either to the natural or the Divine positive law, or to any law of the Church acting within her own sphere ; and they admit, accordingly, that a civil ruler (so far as he has means of knowing these various higher laws) violates his duty in putting forward any such enactment. But they seem to hold that, within these limits, the only legitimate end of the civil governor's legislation and administration is his country's temporal good ; that if he attempts to promote directly her spiritual interests, he is transgressing the province allotted to him by God.

We greatly doubt whether, when both sides come to explain themselves, there will be found any essential difference between these writers and ourselves. Yet we would with great respect entreat them to consider whether they are not sanctioning a mode of speech which in other times may have been comparatively harmless, but which is now full of peril. We would entreat them to consider whether their statement be not such that an acute and logical anti-Catholic, who should take it

nakedly and in the abstract, might carry it forward into consequences from which they themselves would recoil in horror.

For ourselves, as the text of our discussion and the warrant of our doctrine, we start with a passage from Gregory XVI.'s well-known Encyclical, "*Mirari vos.*" It is difficult to imagine words which shall be more explicit and unmistakable:—

But in regard to those good wishes which we put forth for the common safety both of Church and State, may the princes, our most dear children in Christ, forward those wishes by their power and authority; which power and authority let them regard as conferred on them, not only for the world's government, but *most of all for the Church's protection.* Let them carefully consider that whatever labour is expended for the Church's welfare tends really to their own power and tranquillity; and let them esteem it a great privilege (we say with Pope St. Leo) if to their diadem there be also added from the Lord's hand the crown of faith. *Placed as they are in the position of parents and guardians to their peoples,* they will procure for those peoples true, permanent, and profitable rest and tranquillity, if they apply themselves *chiefly* to this care; viz., that religion and piety towards God may be securely preserved.*

It will conduce to the reader's convenience, if, before we begin our argument, we state briefly the conclusions to which that argument will be directed. They are substantially these. The Church was founded exclusively for a spiritual end, and her province is the administration of spirituals; civil government was instituted immediately for a certain temporal end, and its province is the administration of temporals: but the Catholic ruler will act more laudably in proportion as he shall more earnestly endeavour to administer temporals in the way most conducive to his subjects' moral and spiritual welfare. It is always to be understood, indeed, that his labours for that welfare must be carried on throughout in profound deference and subordination to the Church's guidance. Yet we do not base our conclusion on any theory concerning the Church's direct temporal power, and concerning any delegation on her part of

* *Cæterum communibus hisce votis, pro rei et sacræ et publicæ incolumitate, charissimi in Christo filii nostri viri principes suâ faveant ope et auctoritate; quam sibi collatam considerent, non solum ad mundi regimen, sed maxime ad Ecclesiæ præsidium. Animadvertant sedulo, pro illorum imperio et quiete geri, quicquid pro Ecclesiæ salute laboratur; immò pluris sibi suadeant fidei causam esse debere quam regni; magnumque sibi esse perpendant, dicimus cum S. Leone pontifice, "si ipsorum diademati de manu Domini etiam fidei addatur corona." Positi quasi parentes et tutores populorum, veram, constantem, opulentam iis quietem parient et tranquillitatem, si in eam potissimum curam incumbant, ut incolumis sit religio et pietas in Deum, qui habet scriptum in femore, Rex regum et Dominus dominantium.*

such power to the Catholic ruler ; but we base it on grounds totally distinct from this. What so many eminent theologians have so ably said on the Church's indirect temporal power over Christian princes we neither affirm nor deny ; we are contented with the fact that our own reasoning will be altogether independent of that controverted question. We maintain that the civil governor as such, Catholic or non-Catholic, acts more laudably the more earnestly he labours, in his administration of temporals, to advance his subjects' highest good, so far as he is himself cognisant of such good.* And we consider the Catholic ruler as constituting one particular case to which this general principle should be applied.†

We are quite convinced, indeed, not only that the civil governor acts laudably in promoting his people's highest good, but that to some limited extent he is under the *obligation* of doing so. This, however, is a separate and subsequent question, which we shall not consider at present. Whenever, therefore, we say that the civil governor *should* pursue a spiritual end, we do not necessarily imply that he is under the obligation of doing so, but only that such a course is more laudable. And this statement of itself is amply sufficient to bring us into direct conflict with our opponents ; for they hold that if he pursue such an end at all in his political capacity, he is transgressing the province assigned to him by God. They therefore *are* speaking of *obligation* : they must say, if they would be consistent, that he is under the actual obligation of using every effort that his political measures may be in no degree influenced by any consideration for spiritual good as such.

We begin with certain preliminary explanations—of which some indeed are mere definitions, and none will be seriously controverted, but which it is of extreme importance that we carefully bear in mind.

By the *temporal good* of a community is understood a possession of the various external necessities, comforts, and conveniences of life. Protection of person and property ranks among the chief of these ; and this includes, in its very idea, that justice shall be purely administered and easily accessible. Other temporal goods will be such as these : that

* When we use the phrase "cognisant" in this and similar passages, we do not mean, "so far as he, *in fact*, knows such good," but "so far as he has *full means* of knowing it."

† It is for this reason that we profess to treat on the "*intrinsic* end of civil government ;" viz, on that end which falls within its intrinsic sphere, apart from any theory of a delegated power.

honest industry shall securely obtain full sufficiency of food and clothing for the family ; that adequate medical advice shall be readily obtainable by all, in case of sickness or bodily injury ; that locomotion and correspondence by letter shall be as easy and expeditious as possible ; that intellectual gratifications shall be widely enjoyed ; that literature, the fine arts, and other things which similarly conduce to the embellishment of life, shall be in a flourishing state, and a taste for them widely diffused ; that healthy diversions shall abound ; &c. Under the head of temporal good, we must also rank *external liberty*, so called to distinguish it from *internal liberty*,—the self-determining power with which man's will is endowed. By external liberty we mean the power of each citizen, without external control, to carry out his various wishes and resolves. External liberty, again, may be divided into *political* and *social* liberty, accordingly as the external restraint from which we are free is, on the one hand, a restraint enforced by law, or, on the other hand, a restraint enforced by the pressure of public opinion. External liberty can never absolutely exist, for there must always be some restraint on the citizen's volitions ; and, again, what degree of external liberty conduces to moral and spiritual good, is a question depending altogether on circumstances. But so far forth as external liberty exists, in that proportion undoubtedly temporal good is increased ; for such liberty is a great addition to the external comforts and conveniences of life.

As to *moral and spiritual good*, the meaning of this term is sufficiently evident for our present purpose, without any attempt at more accurate definition. A large portion of this good is cognisable and demonstrable as such by reason ; though it is a very different question how far unassisted reason could, in fact, have discovered it. A large portion of it, however, including of course the whole supernatural order, is known only by revelation. One further remark should here be made. It is a truth demonstrable by unassisted reason, that no human act can be morally good, except so far as its motive is pure ; and that we are more pleasing to our Creator, in proportion as we possess in greater degree the habitual interior disposition of conforming ourselves to His will and preference.

Next, as to the constitution and authority of civil government:

1. If men are to rise from a state of barbarism and savage conflict, if they are to live together even in tolerable ease and tranquillity, it is absolutely necessary that in any given place there shall be some one authority, having so much physical power at its command as to render permanent resistance hopeless. If there be no one authority thus transcendent in

physical power, the peace and tranquillity of society will be disturbed to the very foundation by each man's conflict with his neighbours. On the other hand, if there be more than one body thus pre-eminent in strength, peace and tranquillity will be hardly less disturbed by the conflict of such bodies with each other. Civil war, if prolonged for any length of time, is nothing less than an inchoate relapse into anarchy; and the same thing may truly be said of protracted invasion, so far as regards the particular region occupied by invaders.

2. A state of barbarism and anarchy is so manifestly and so very deeply injurious to men's best and highest interests, that no other proof is needed to show the Divine origin and sanction of civil government. Apart from the evils of anarchy in the intellectual and material order,* its moral results are most disastrous. Consider, *e.g.*, how the Church's action is paralysed in proportion as civil tranquillity is disturbed. The orderly and regular training of children, nay, all systematic instruction of the flock, is rendered impossible. Approach to the sacraments, which our corrupt nature makes sufficiently distasteful in itself, encounters a fresh and tremendous obstacle in the prevalent turbulence. Self-will and hatred of restraint, those evil passions which poison the very principle of religious obedience, grow up with unrestrained violence.† That interior recollectedness, which is the one atmosphere wherein grace raises the soul towards perfection, becomes a thousandfold more difficult, from the unceasing alarms and agitations of the period.

3. This one authority having so much physical power at its command as to render permanent resistance hopeless, is, of course, the civil government. It may be vested absolutely in one prince; or a number of persons may have an integral share in its administration. In the latter case, there must be certain defined relations between those who have a share in it, according to which the supreme authority is exercised; and the sum of all these various relations is the political constitution. In these islands, *e.g.*, every member of parliament, nay, in strictness, every voter, possesses an integral share in the

* The temporal evils of anarchy are admirably stated in the introduction to S. Thomas's work "*De Regimine Principum*," and also by Molina, "*De Jure et Justitia*," tract 2, d. 22, à n. 8. For the latter quotation we are indebted to Dr. Murray's most valuable *Treatise on Education*, in the second volume of his "*Annual Miscellany*."

† *Quamvis juris prudentia justitiam civilem non excedat, utpote quæ manum tantum per se cohibeat, attamen ea maxime prodest ut justitia, moralis et spiritualis, quæ cor ipsum attingit, perficiatur.*—Giunchi, "*De Intellectu*," n. 67.

government—greater or less, of this or that kind, as the case may be. And here occurs one very obvious truth, which it is of extreme importance to remember. Whatever be the true principles on which the ruler, when absolute, should conduct his legislation and administration, these are the very same principles on which each individual ruler should exercise his political functions, in cases where the government is mixed. Or, to put it more specifically: if it be laudable that a Catholic absolute prince shall direct his legislation to his country's spiritual welfare, it must be laudable, in the same sense and in the same degree, that a Catholic member of the British Parliament shall give such votes as may best promote the spiritual well-being of the British empire. In the following pages, then, whenever we use the words "ruler," "civil governor," "prince,"—it must be understood that we include under that name every one possessing any share in the civil government of any state, so far as regards the exercise of his political functions.

4. From what has been said, it follows that the immediate end for which God has instituted civil government is the protection of person and property; or, as theologians sometimes express it, the preservation of exterior peace. A man, or body of men, who should give no protection to person or property, would have no claim to the very title of civil government. A civil government which should in some small degree preserve exterior peace, but should not have sufficient power to do so with reasonable completeness, is, as it were, an infant and immature government. A civil government which has power sufficient for that purpose but fails to use it, is *ipso facto* tyrannical and unjust. The preservation of exterior peace is a duty appertaining characteristically to the civil government; appertaining to it in a certain special sense, in which no other duties can possibly appertain to it.

It will be asked how this statement can be reconciled with our doctrine that the State's highest and most admirable function is to promote moral and spiritual good. The inquiry is most reasonable; and before concluding our article, we will give to it a definite and, we think, most satisfactory reply. Here we make but one remark. We have seen that the immediate end for which God instituted government is the preservation of exterior peace; but it by no means follows from this, that the ultimate end contemplated by God, even in its primary institution, is solely or chiefly the promotion of temporal good. Exterior peace is in itself, no doubt, a temporal good; but it is most vitally important, as we have already seen, for a country's spiritual advancement. Since, therefore, God regards spiritual good as immeasurably preferable to temporal, it follows that

His primary institution of civil government is chiefly, though of course not exclusively, for an ultimate spiritual end.

So much for preliminaries. In commencing our argument, we must bear in mind what we have already said on the necessity of avoiding Scylla no less than Charybdis. We will begin, therefore, by enumerating those methods of promoting spiritual good which (by consent of every Catholic) are beyond the State's competence; and in each case we will also give a reason for such incompetence.

The civil governor has no authority whatever of spiritual legislation. Under this term we include two things. Part of our meaning is, that he has no authority of ecclesiastical legislation. He has no authority to command what vestments or ceremonies shall be used at mass; or under what conditions priests shall be ordained; or who shall have power to hear confessions; &c., &c. The meaning and the ground of this statement are so obvious that another word would be superfluous.

But further, he has no authority of what we may call directly moral and religious legislation. Here it is necessary that our readers shall clearly understand the distinction which we intend between that *directly* moral and religious legislation which is beyond the civil governor's authority, and that *indirectly* moral and religious legislation which we maintain to be his highest and most admirable function. As this is one of those distinctions which are far better understood by example than by definition, we will give our examples first and our definitions afterwards.

Let us make, therefore, the supposition that the civil governor issues a law requiring me to say so many prayers at such periods, or to fast so often in the week, all for my soul's good; and let us further suppose that some theorist were to start up and maintain that I am bound in conscience to obey such a law. In proportion as I practically feel the sacredness of that charge with which God has entrusted me, the care of my own moral and spiritual culture; in proportion as I feel the absolute necessity, in order to that culture, of preserving the individuality of my own inward development free from all intrusive circumscription,—in that proportion should I protest most earnestly and emphatically against this atrocious theory. What! shall the sacred and intimate relations which exist between my Creator and myself be invaded by a meddling and intrusive government? Shall I be coerced as to my very prayers and meditations by an authority which thus takes on itself the most awfully responsible of duties, and does not so much as claim any special light or discernment for its due performance? Other tyrannies may cause,

and, in fact, have caused, much greater suffering than this ; but none surely, was ever in principle so monstrous and outrageous.

It is most true, indeed, that the Catholic Church does claim the very authority which is here in question. And we fully admit that no one duly penetrated with such considerations as the above could legitimately submit to that authority, except for the Church's distinctive claims. No right-minded person, we say, could possibly submit to the Church's legislation on such subjects, were he not thoroughly convinced (as every Catholic, of course, *is* thoroughly convinced) that she has received a direct commission from God to enact such laws, and that she is accordingly guided by Divine light and grace, in a most special degree, towards the fulfilment of her office. And experience most amply bears out what the Catholic antecedently expects. For nothing is more remarkable than the singular moderation with which the Church has ever exercised her office of directly moral and religious legislation, and the ample scope given within her communion for every variety of individual development. On this head none can speak with greater feeling and emphasis, than those who have escaped from the crushing tyranny of some sect into the happy liberty of God's favoured children.*

Next, for our example of indirectly moral and religious legislation. Let us suppose that the government imposes on me a tax for the advancement of some purely spiritual end ; an end, moreover, if you please, with which I am entirely out of sympathy. It is by no means enough to say that those objections which exist against the former kind of legislation, do not hold *equally* against this : they do not hold against it in the very slightest degree. I may grumble heartily, indeed, at having to pay such a tax ; but it no more tends to interfere, ever so slightly, with my private religious practices and habits, than if the tax were levied for some unwise and expensive war against France or Russia. Nay, and it is just as probable that I may thoroughly dislike the secular as the spiritual purpose to which the public money is applied.

When we say, then, that the civil governor has no power of directly moral and religious legislation, we mean that he has no power of commanding religious or ascetical exercises

* Nothing contained in the text forbids us from thinking, and we do think, that under certain circumstances, and in a certain state of society, the civil governor may properly and usefully punish the transgressors of ecclesiastical laws. But we would earnestly maintain that such power should never be exercised except at the Church's solicitation, and, as it were, under her very eye.

as such. Or, putting the matter more accurately, we may express it thus. He has no power of commanding interior acts either directly or indirectly;* nor yet of commanding such external acts as do not conduce to his end (whether that end be spiritual or temporal), except in virtue of the interior acts which should accompany them. Suppose, *e.g.*, that the State enjoined the recitation (even in private) of certain prayers, or the observance of certain fasts, in order to obtain from God the most purely temporal good. Such legislation is directed to a purely temporal end; and yet every Catholic would at once feel that it is absolutely null and void. And this very fact, indeed, gives a certain indication that, according to Catholic instincts, the distinction between the two provinces of ecclesiastical and civil legislation turns rather on the intrinsic character of the thing commanded, than on the end to which the legislation is directed.†

Such, then, is the kind of legislation, which, by consent of all Catholics, is totally beyond the province of civil government. By "indirectly moral and religious legislation" is meant the making laws which do not partake at all of the above character; but which, nevertheless, are framed, directly and expressly, for promoting the moral and spiritual good of a community, or of some portion thereof. That this latter kind of legislation is most fully within the State's province, and is, indeed, its most admirable function, is the main thesis of our article.

In regard, then, to the ground on which we base the State's incompetence for directly moral and religious legislation, two things should be observed. Firstly, we do not at all

* It is, perhaps, the more common opinion of theologians that the Church has not the power of directly commanding interior acts; but all teach that indirectly she may command most important ones. Thus, in commanding annual confession, she indirectly commands the eliciting, at least once a year, true attrition for sin. See Suarez, "*De Legibus*," l. 4, c. 12, 13. See also the 14th proposition condemned by Alexander VII., with Viva's comment. It is, perhaps, hardly worth while to mention that, in one (rather forced) sense, it may be said that the State *can* command indirectly interior acts; viz., that if it issues a just law and one not purely penal, certain interior acts become thereby morally evil; such *e.g.* as the intention of violating this law. See Suarez, "*De Legibus*" l. 3, c. 13, n. 9. We have exactly given Suarez' doctrine; but his expression is somewhat different. He says that civil laws can command interior acts *indirectly*, viz., in the sense above explained; but that ecclesiastical laws can command them also *concomitantly*, viz., as accompanying the external acts which she directly commands.

† *Licet potestas politica et ejus lex dicantur temporales ratione objecti, quia versantur circa temporalia et externa, tamen in se res sunt spirituales.* —Bellarmine, "*De Laicis*," c. 11, n. 16.

derive our argument from the circumstance that *the Church* has been commissioned for that purpose. This circumstance, indeed, would in itself have been a sufficient ground for our conclusion; but even had the case been otherwise, had God founded no Church at all, our own reasoning would remain in all its force. That reasoning rests on the fact that no special light and grace have ever been promised to the civil governor for the discharge of so unspeakably momentous a function. So long as this is the case, there could not be a more revolting and monstrous tyranny than his attempting any such interference with the individual's religious habits. Neither, secondly, do we found our reasoning on the principle that the State, being founded for a natural end, may not pursue supernatural good. We do not admit such a principle; but even if we did, it would be quite irrelevant. God was, of course, perfectly free to raise men, or not to raise them, into the supernatural order; and we may most easily, therefore, make the supposition that He had not. He might none the less have given us external aids of the natural order, whereby we might have abundant moral power to advance indefinitely, both in purity of moral intention and in love for our Creator.* Had this been the course of His Providence, the advancing in these virtues would have been the advancing to a purely natural end; and yet it would have been no less true in that case than it is now, that the civil government would act with intolerable tyranny in presuming to put forth any directly moral and religious legislation.

Here, then, is one province from which the State is wholly excluded,—the province of spiritual legislation. Under this head are included (1) ecclesiastical, and (2) directly moral and religious legislation.

But there is a second office for which every Catholic ruler will also acknowledge his incompetence. He will not presume to undertake the direct maintenance and propagation of religious truth: whether by authoritatively declaring what he regards as such, and denouncing what he regards as error; or by delegating ministers and officers for the purpose of enforcing such truth on the hearts and consciences of the people. He well knows that God has instituted the Church for the express purpose of doing both these things; and that he is presumptuously encroaching on her territory if he attempts them. It will, indeed, be his highest and most

* The Church has condemned, in Baius's 34th proposition, the notion that there cannot imaginably be a natural love of God external to the supernatural order.

admirable function (we consider) to assist her in the performance of her work by the various political means at his disposal; but all such assistance must, of course, be given in most complete subordination and submission to her supreme authority.

A question here arises. It is easily imaginable that some ruler may be invincibly ignorant of the Church's just claims: how far will *he* act laudably in attempting the direct maintenance and propagation of religious truth (so far as he is cognisant of such truth) among the mass of his people? We speak here under correction and with diffidence; but we incline to the opinion that he *will* act laudably by making the attempt, within certain limits which need not be here specified.* At the same time we confidently maintain that he would find the task filled with every kind of anxiety and difficulty; and that a Catholic prince may well felicitate himself on being wholly free from this overwhelming responsibility. It is not necessary, however, for our ensuing argument, to enter further on this particular question; and we will, therefore, altogether waive the conclusion to which we ourselves incline. We will admit for argument's sake in the case of a prince inculpably non-Catholic, what is so undeniably true in the case of a Catholic, that he has no concern with the direct maintenance and propagation of religious truth.

We have now, then (as appears to us), exhausted the legitimate meaning of Catholics, when they say that the civil government is excluded from the sphere of spirituals. Firstly, the ruler has no power of spiritual legislation, whether ecclesiastical or directly moral and religious. Secondly, he has no concern with the direct maintenance and propagation of religious truth. And thirdly, whatever a Catholic prince does for the promotion of spiritual good, must be done in complete subordination and submission to the Church's authority. Since, then, he is excluded from this more directly spiritual sphere of action, his province may with great propriety be called temporal. It should further be added (though we cannot here enlarge on the subject), that there are various important rights of family and of property, which are also *de jure* sacred from his interference. But such offices as the following, by consent of all, appertain to the civil governor. It is his proper function to take all necessary means for protecting person and property; to lay down the rules and standards of judicial

* *Agendum est de cultu divino, ad quem reges et principes studere debent toto conatu et sollicitudine tanquam ad finem debitum.*—*S. Thomas, "De Regimine Principum,"* l. 2, c. 16.

procedure; to determine what acts shall be treated as punishable offences, and with what kind and degree of punishment; to levy taxes in this or that degree and method; to administer the public money in this way or that; to determine peace and war; to enforce this or that degree of restraint, in this or that way, against the publicly advocating this or that doctrine, whether religious or secular; &c., &c. Nor can any one doubt that extremely great service or disservice may be done to the nation's spiritual good, according to the use made of these most extensive powers. It is, therefore, a most momentous question, how far he should regulate his political acts by a consideration of such welfare. Our opponents maintain that he violates his duty by doing so at all; we maintain, on the contrary, that he acts more laudably in proportion as he does so more energetically: and on this question issue is to be joined.

We will thus express our fundamental thesis: The intrinsic end which should be pursued by a civil governor in his political action is the highest good of his people; and predominantly, therefore, their moral and spiritual welfare, so far as he is cognisant of such welfare. Nor does any thing need explanation here, except the word "predominantly." We are not, then, at all denying that in a great number of cases the ruler may work for temporal good without in any way injuring spiritual; and in all such cases he cannot do better than devote his whole political energy to the achievement of such good. But whenever the two do appear to clash, we maintain that the spiritual good should *predominate*. And this, of course, is Gregory the Sixteenth's meaning, when by implication he exhorts Catholic princes to give their care *chiefly* (*potissimum*) to the security of religion. He does not mean that the greatest part of their time, their attention, their actual thought should be given to the security of religion; but that whenever (apparent) temporal good clashes with the security of religion, the latter should take precedence of the former.

We will next supplement our fundamental thesis by a second; which applies the general principle contained in the first to the particular case of a Catholic ruler: Every civil governor who has full means of knowing the Church's Divine authority, is under the obligation of estimating his people's spiritual good according to her doctrine; and of promoting it (so far as he does promote it) in complete and constant subordination to her authority and guidance.* This thesis

* Quia igitur vitæ, quâ in præsentî benè vivimus, finis est beatitudo cœlestis, ad regis officium pertinet eâ ratione vitam multitudinis bonam procurare

must of course be regarded as axiomatic, by all those who believe that the Catholic Church really is what she claims to be.

We must hasten, however, to append one or two explanations of our meaning. Our first thesis in particular might lead to the suspicion that we have some tenderness for a certain theory, or practice, which none can abhor more sincerely than ourselves. We allude to that view of the State's autocratic authority which leads the government, in various parts of Europe, to aim at overriding all other influences; to interfere, with vexatious minuteness, in the details of daily life; and to repress by a crushing tyranny the free development of man's individuality. But it really seems to us that we are able on our principles to make a more effective stand against this most odious form of State tyranny than our opponents can on theirs. For it is our very principle that the State should ever consider the people's highest good; and their highest good (in the present state of European civilization) is fatally thwarted and impeded by such a system of stringent repression and restraint.

Again, we are neither expressing nor implying any opinion on such questions as these: the directness and frequency with which any Catholic prince should press religion on the attention of his subjects; the degree of repression (if any) which he should exercise in regard to anti-Catholic or irreligious books; the position which he should assume towards his non-Catholic subjects; &c., &c. It is indeed quite impossible, if we wished it, to make any kind of general statement on these heads: for those very enactments which are most salutary under one set of circumstances may at another time, or in another place, be absolutely fatal to the best interests of religion. And we most willingly admit that an individual prince may—

secundum quod congruit ad cœlestem beatitudinem consequendam, ut scilicet ea præcipiat quæ ad cœlestem beatitudinem ducunt, et eorum contraria, secundum quod fuerit possibile, interdicit. Quæ autem sit ad veram beatitudinem via, ex lege divinâ cognoscitur, cujus doctrina pertinet ad sacerdotium.—S. Thomas, "*De Regimine Principum*," l. 1, c. 15.

Finis ad quem *principaliter* rex intendere debet in seipso et in subditis est eterna beatitudo quæ in visione Dei consistit. . . . *tunc optime regit, si talis in ipso sit finis intentus.*—*Ibid.* l. 3, c. 3.

Si temporalis administratio impedit spirituale bonum, *omnium* judicio tenetur princeps temporalis mutare illum modum administrandi. *etiam cum detrimento temporalis boni.*—Bellarmine, "*De Summo Pontifice*," l. 5, c. 7, n. 5.

Secundus error est aliorum, qui ad alterum extremum deflectentes, dicunt reges debere curare *republicam suam et pacem publicam*, de religione autem non curare; sed permittere singulis ut sentiant prout voluerint et vivant ut voluerint, *modò non perturbent pacem publicam.* . . . *Hic error perniciosissimus est.*—Bellarmine, "*De Laicis*," c. 18, n. 1, 3.

not indeed be too earnest in his anxiety to draw his people towards God (for this we hold to be impossible), but—be extremely unwise and injudicious in the means which he adopts for that end. We only maintain that this should be his predominant end; and that he abdicates his highest function if he confines his efforts to the promotion of their temporal good.

Lastly, our readers may fear that our first thesis may be wrested by a Protestant government to a bad purpose, and be made a pretext for persecuting the true religion. We mention this objection thus early for the purpose of guarding against that prejudice which would reasonably arise if it were thought that we had not carefully considered it. In a future article we hope to meet it fully and in detail.

Such are our explanations. And the precise principle at issue will be more clearly seen if we contemplate it, not in abstract statement, but in actual operation. Now our opponents represent their view as one of great practical moment; they imply, therefore, that the cases are neither infrequent nor unimportant in which the pursuit of spiritual good would lead the government in one direction, and the pursuit of temporal good in another. How far and in what sense we agree with this will very soon appear; for the present we will take for granted their implied statement, and by its help illustrate the proposition for which they contend. Let us suppose, then, some such case to arise. One line of policy will best promote the nation's spiritual good, but another will be more advantageous for its temporal welfare. Moreover, some given person, who either wields the whole authority of government or has some assignable share in it—say, *e.g.*, a member of the British Parliament—is thoroughly convinced of this fact. According to our opponents, his one most laudable course is to put forth his whole political action and influence for the *latter* of these two policies; because, in their view, by aiming at spiritual good in any part of his political conduct, he transgresses his province and violates a strict obligation. But, according to the doctrine which we earnestly maintain, his political conduct should be the very reverse of this; he should labour no less earnestly as a politician than as a man to gain for his country what he believes to be its highest good.

We really find it difficult to imagine what further argument can be needed on this alternative than thus openly to state it. According to the opposite view, a civil governor acts more laudably by putting forth his whole political influence towards inflicting on his country the gravest injury: for can any injury be graver than that its highest good should be sacrificed to a lower? In fact, according to them, he is altogether to separate

(by some inexplicable process) his political and his personal action. In his private capacity he should strain every nerve in one direction, but all his votes and political influence are to be thrown into the opposite scale. One really has a right to insist upon some very demonstrative evidence before one can even give a hearing to so paradoxical a proposition. On a question, however, of such moment we must not think of thus settling the matter, as it were, by a stroke of the pen; we must draw out in some detail our own argument, and consider in some detail our opponents' objections. And these opponents, as has been already implied, belong to two most widely different classes.

When politicians and men of the world indignantly deny our thesis, what they practically mean is, that their own whole interest lies with the temporal and not with the spiritual order. Now, if any such men distinctly disown belief in the One True God, we have no controversy with *them* on the present occasion; in general, however, they shrink from any such denial. But there cannot in the whole world be a tenet more monstrous and unblushing than that God indeed exists, but that temporal interests are even commensurable in importance with religious. These men, therefore, are compelled in theory to admit the superior claim of the latter; and since (from their hatred of spirituals) their political conduct is entirely directed to secular ends, they are driven to take refuge in the theory that the State has no concern with religious truth. They profess, then, under compulsion, that very doctrine, which our theological opponents (if we may so call them) feel from the very bottom of their hearts; viz., that religious well-being is immeasurably more important than temporal. It so happens, therefore, that both classes of our opponents, vast as is really the gulf which separates them, may be met formally by the same course of reasoning. And if, in any part of our argument, we may seem to speak disparagingly and severely of those with whom we are at issue, we earnestly entreat our theological opponents to bear in mind, once for all, that *they* form no part whatever of that class against which such language is directed. We should, indeed, take to ourselves most serious blame, if we said any thing which, even by implication, could be construed into the slightest want of respect for *them*; but we should hardly take to ourselves less blame, if we either expressed or implied any feeling milder than that of detestation and abhorrence, in regard to the principles of those worldly and political antagonists against whom we also contend.

Our first course of reasoning shall be of a negative character.

We will contend that there is no imaginable doctrine, differing from our own, which our opponents can steadily look in the face and embrace as theirs, so long as they remain true to their profession; so long as they recognize the immeasurably superior importance which attaches to spiritual over temporal well-being.

Since so much is said of temporal good as the highest intrinsic end of civil government, we have a right to ask at the outset whether government is to pursue the nation's permanent and abiding, or merely its proximate and immediate, temporal good. If the former, we reply at once that there is no way of really promoting its permanent and abiding temporal good, except by advancing its spiritual welfare; and a little consideration will make this abundantly manifest.

The great majority of every nation are the lowest and poorest class; and they are also those who, from their helplessness and feebleness, have the greatest claim on government for help and consideration. The temporal good, then, of the whole community will be best promoted, if the poor are contented, sober, industrious, and loyal, while the rich are disinterestedly and prudently benevolent; if the laws are so administered that the poorest shall have equal security for their right with the richest; if politicians, whether speculative or active, give up all self-seeking and ambition, give up all exclusive regard to class interests, and devote themselves with pure intention, with untiring zeal, with their whole intellectual resources, to the material well-being of the masses. Facts will at best, alas! be ever miserably below such an ideal as this; but so far as it is even distantly approached, an amount of temporal good will accrue to the great majority, in comparison with which all benefits arising from free trade, or railway extension, or postal facilities, or commercial treaties, are literally but as dust in the balance. Supposing, therefore, that the highest legitimate end of civil government were the permanent and abiding promotion of temporal good, such is the picture which a ruler should ever keep before his mind: to this purpose should he direct his chief policy, that future generations shall be trained in such habits as we have just described. But in this direction he is powerless to advance one step, he stands as it were helpless and paralyzed, unless he call to his aid the agencies of pure religion.

We have no wish to colour or exaggerate; we admit most freely that though the rich were actuated by the purest benevolence which love of God could engender, such benevolence would fail grievously of its legitimate result, unless it were

directed by a careful, intelligent, laborious investigation of social facts and principles. By all means, therefore, we say, let government do all which it legitimately can to promote such intellectual habits. But though benevolence can do little without intelligence, intelligence can do nothing without benevolence. And the growth of such self-sacrificing, disinterested benevolence among the educated can only be promoted, as a general rule, by their steady growth in true piety. Sentimental and transitory benevolence, nay, a few generous efforts for a few definite objects, may often enough be found in irreligious men. But a steady, sustained, self-sacrificing preference for the community's temporal well-being over their own and that of their class,—this can only be obtained by that love of man which is founded on love of God. Yet it is most unquestionably on such benevolence as this that the permanent temporal good of a community predominantly depends.* Now great as are the mutual differences of those who profess the Christian name, there is one point at least on which all agree; viz., that whatever religion be simply true and from God, it is that, far more than any other, which will engender disinterested love of our fellow-creatures. So that if it be the office of civil government to promote permanent and abiding temporal good, it is no less its office to promote pure and true religion.

We are also brought to the same conclusion by a different road. Our opponents mention, as one advantage of their theory, that, if it be once admitted, the co-operation of discordant religionists in the same civil government becomes comparatively easy. This, however, is plainly quite a mistake, so far as regards that particular form of their theory which we are now noticing. Every good Catholic will think that the extension of Catholicism is the best possible means of advancing his country's temporal welfare. Protestants, on their side, are equally unanimous in regarding the prevalence of Catholicism as most hostile to material interests; they hold it as certain, that our holy religion (so far as it is diffused) will assuredly produce habits of laziness and disorder, and promote a retrograde movement from all the blessings of modern civilization. Whether, therefore, it be the Catholic or the Protestant legislator who considers that his highest political

* The Church, by fixing public and private morality on its only sure and permanent basis, religion; by promoting that charity, purity, forbearance, disinterestedness, which is the natural effect of a religious estimate of the vanity of this world; becomes the most powerful auxiliary of the State . . . in establishing peace, order, submission to lawful authority, general security.
— *Dr. Murray On Education*, p. 303.

end should be the country's permanent temporal good,—in either case he will regard it as an integral part of his legislative functions to give his own religion every legitimate advantage over its rivals.*

And while this version of our opponents' theory possesses every evil which they can possibly attribute to ours, it possesses other evils also exclusively its own. One of these is so important as to deserve distinct mention. If a Catholic legislator understands that by entering Parliament he undertakes a serious spiritual responsibility; that he has a sacred duty to perform towards the highest good of his fellow-countrymen; such considerations would tend to exercise an elevating and sanctifying influence over his character. But suppose him to be taught that he should promote indeed the Church's spiritual interests, yet only as one *means* towards the temporal prosperity of Great Britain and Ireland; that, in his political capacity, he is bound to aim at the higher good in no other way than as an instrument to the lower;—such teaching must tend utterly to perplex and bewilder him.

Our opponents, then, if they remain such, will have to reply that government should aim, not at permanent and abiding, but only at proximate and immediate, temporal good. In other words, they will say that its functions begin and end with the protection of person and property against domestic and foreign aggression; that it should simply take such measures as are most effective for that end; and that the nation's growth in temporal no less than in spiritual good must be left to individual agency. This is the well-known *laissez-faire* theory, which was very popular in England some years ago, and which is still not without its advocates.† In order that we may appreciate its merits, let us pass under review some few universally admitted functions of government, and consider how such a theory would guide it in the performance of such functions.

1. Every State must, by absolute necessity, lay down some law or other in regard to marriage. This fact is plain on

* We are not at all implying that in our own country, or in others similarly circumstanced, Catholics and Protestants may not work together harmoniously in the Legislature; in a future article we hope to argue for the opposite conclusion. Our reasoning in the text is *ad hominem*. Our opponents maintain, that on our theory discordant religionists could never co-operate with advantage in any legislature; we reply, that if this were impossible on our theory, it would be no less so on theirs.

† The political bearings of this theory (which are beside our subject) are excellently treated by Mr. Stuart Mill in the last part of his work on Political Economy; though we do not, of course, adopt all his conclusions.

various grounds. Firstly, the State does not fulfil its primary function of protecting person and property, unless it gives me full protection in my family relations ; but in order to do this, it must decide who *is* my wife and which *is* my family. Then, secondly, everyone counts among the State's necessary functions the enforcing legal contracts. It must by absolute necessity, then, treat either as legal or illegal a quasi-matrimonial contract between two persons while another wife or husband is still alive ; or between two persons who are within certain degrees of kindred or affinity. The civil governor, we say, must follow some system or other on the marriage relation. What shall that system be, and on what grounds shall it be chosen? Our opponents must say that he should choose that system which will be most effective in protecting the nation against immediate tumults and disorders ; and that he goes beyond his province if he allows any other consideration whatever to influence his legislation. Is there anyone who will gravely uphold such a tenet as this?

Here, however, our theological opponents will interpose a most reasonable disclaimer. They will remind us of a very essential doctrine included in their theory—viz., that no law can bind the conscience which is at variance with God's Command, and that no legislator, cognisant of the Command, can without sin enact such a law. But we have not forgotten for a moment that such is their doctrine ; nor is it at all necessary for the purpose of our argument to suppose that the State commands anything which God has forbidden. Take such a supposition, *e.g.*, as the following:—An extremely strong feeling may exist throughout some nation in favour of a second marriage being made legal where the first wife has been unfaithful. And to prevent complication, we will further suppose it not to be even contemplated that this second union should be legally enforced where either party may wish to dissolve it. Here, then, is a project of law which commands nothing forbidden by God ; which puts no pressure of any kind on those who are resolved to obey the Divine law as testified by the Church ; but whose scope is altogether different from this. This nation, again, we further suppose, is under a constitutional government, and various Catholics have a part in that government. A Catholic legislator may arrive at the clearest conviction that immediate peace and tranquillity will be very greatly promoted by the enactment of this law, because of the deep public dissatisfaction which will attend any other arrangement. Our theological opponents would surely none the less call on such a legislator to stand by his religion, and use his best political influence against the unhappy measure. Yet, we would ask them with great respect, are they not herein

admitting the very principle for which we contend? Are they not admitting that the civil governor's intrinsic end should be predominantly moral and spiritual good?

2. Next take the question of education. According to the precise theory now before us, the civil governor has no concern with children, except to prevent them from picking pockets or causing any immediate disturbance. If he is a Catholic, however personally zealous he may be to forward religious education, in his political capacity he must not move one finger to help the Church in her extremest need. He may allow private individuals, at their own charge, to do so, and he will himself do so from his private funds. But here his power ends.

3. This matter of education suggests another difficulty. No machinery is more efficacious, whether for education or various other important ends, than the endowments bestowed for those ends by private citizens. The State, however, exercises the inalienable privilege of forbidding such endowments when they are at variance with the public good; or enforcing some change of destination when, in progress of years, they become so. Now, the most mischievous doctrines imaginable do not issue in *immediate* evil: in all ordinary cases a considerable course of time elapses between the sowing of error and the reaping of misery; the poison of false doctrine is slow and gradual of operation in proportion as it is deadly. Atheism, *e.g.*, or socialism, in due time not only eats like a canker into the moral life of a community, but tends also most surely to the overthrow of temporal order and tranquillity; but no one will say that such evil effects accrue in the outset. It is only by slow degrees that the full meaning of any revolutionary doctrine is apprehended; and when it is apprehended, its practical applications are still but gradually evolved. Now, those with whom we are at present arguing maintain that the civil governor is forbidden by God to consider any future results, and is required to pursue no higher end than immediate tranquillity and good order. They may intelligibly say, then, that he should forbid all endowments; or else they may intelligibly say that he should *protect* all endowments: those which may be founded for the promotion of socialism and atheism, no less sedulously than those founded for religious education and for the mitigation of moral and physical evil. But between these alternatives, on their principle, there is no middle course.

4. A question of great social, and indeed religious, importance is much discussed at this day among speculative politicians of this and other countries. Is it desirable that property should accumulate in large masses, as in England? or is

the extremely opposite state of things preferable, which exists in France? or, lastly, is some intermediate alternative better than either? There is the greatest divergency of opinion here; but no one has ever doubted that the legislature of any country, without violating any existing right, may tend most influentially to secure either of these results. On a common-sense view the *principles* are obvious enough which the legislator should follow in dealing with this question, great as may be his difficulty in arriving at a confident *conclusion*. He must consider, in the first place, which of these various arrangements will in his own country best promote the people's spiritual and temporal good; and having thus determined his end, he will consult political economy and other kindred sciences to furnish him with the means of carrying it out. He will use, of course, all due prudence in refraining from any sudden change of policy; but he will set himself to inaugurate a steady course of legislation tending to the desired result. Now, according to the theory which we are opposing, the whole of this is one continued transgression of his legitimate province. He is bound to legislate haphazard and in the dark, so far as regards the future distribution of property: his one only concern is to defend from aggression that which now exists.

5. On the same theory, the State has no authority to suppress the publication of flagitious and abominable books, &c.; for, fearfully as they injure the soul, no one can maintain that they interfere with complete present security for person and property.

6. The power of inflicting capital punishment is necessarily vested in the civil governor for protection of human life: he has been entrusted by God with the awful power of cutting short an immortal soul's period of probation and opportunity for repentance. What is to be said of the proposition that it is his bounden duty to exercise that power on each occasion, without any reference whatever to the welfare of that soul? nay, without any reference whatever to the effects which may be produced on public morality, or on individual and national character? What is to be said of the proposition that God, who has bestowed on him this tremendous commission, has strictly commanded him to exercise it without regard to any other end than the immediate preservation of tranquillity and good order?—a truly suggestive question, which we hope our readers will pursue into its various details.

We might fill the whole number with further illustrations; but we have said quite enough to make clear the bearing of our argument, and must therefore pass on. We will merely pause one moment to sum up what has been hitherto urged.

Certain thinkers maintain that the civil governor's intrinsic end should be temporal good and nothing higher. These men are speaking either of permanent, or of immediate, temporal good. If of the former, it is inseparably and inextricably mixed up with spiritual good ; if of the latter, they are landed in conclusions from which common sense and common feeling recoil.

A third hypothesis may be imagined, differing from the two former, and yet falling short of our own conclusions. It may be held that a ruler should promote among his people those principles of morality which reason by itself can recognize ; but that all attempt at the practical advancement of revealed religion is an impertinent deviation from his allotted sphere. To estimate this hypothesis, let us first consider what *are* those principles of morality which reason by itself can recognize.

It may be established by reason that purity, humility, forgivingness, are among the highest of virtues, and their opposites among the most heinous of sins. It may be established by reason that we were created by a Being Infinite in all Perfections. And it is a very obvious dictate of reason that, since we have been thus created, our highest duty and our highest blessedness is to love and serve Him. We grow in real virtue (so reason peremptorily declares) in proportion as we acquire a deep practical sense that the greatest possible advancement in wealth, or in power, or in intellectual cultivation, is of value immeasurably small when compared with the smallest growth in love for that Being and in readiness to hear and obey His commands.

It follows, therefore, that, on the hypothesis which we are now considering, it falls within the ruler's appointed sphere to do what in him lies for the nurture of his subjects in these admirable qualities. It falls within his sphere to do what in him lies, that his subjects may be pure, humble, and forgiving ; that they may abound in the love and fear of God ; that they may grow in a deep and practical sense of that solemn truth which we have just enunciated. It is hardly worth while to make the obvious remark that no Catholic ruler will regard any means as even possible for attaining these high objects, except the giving every encouragement and help, under the Church's guidance, to the Church's ministrations. Nor will Protestants, on their side, be behindhand in assuming that the progress of what *they* consider pure religion affords the only hope of promoting the practice of that morality which nature by itself is able indeed to recognize, but unable to fulfil.

We indulge the sanguine hope that those whom we have throughout called our theological opponents, will long ere this

have recognized a substantial agreement between their views and our own. But we have no such hope with regard to that other class with whom we are so directly at issue. Our theological opponents, if they differ from us at all, differ at least far more in expression than in substance; whereas the other class differ far more in substance even than in expression. They are hampered throughout (as we have already said) by that doctrine which they are compelled to admit speculatively, but against which, in truth, they so profoundly revolt—viz., that spirituals are immeasurably more important than temporals. When they contend so earnestly for the divorce of politics from religion, they contend, in fact, for a certain principle altogether inconsistent with the above-named doctrine, and for that very reason most congenial and most dear to them. It is an essential part, then, of our negative argument to put clearly before our readers what we believe that principle to be. We cannot, however, do so without making a few introductory remarks.

There is no more wonderful phenomenon in the whole world, though its very commonness, in fact, prevents us from wondering at it, than the way in which a great multitude of men accept Christian morality. Every Catholic will speculatively admit those moral principles mentioned by us in a previous page. He will admit that the true path of virtue lies in the way of humility, forgivingness, and indifference to the world's censure; in the constant readiness to hear and obey God's voice. Nor can a Protestant, who with any kind of sincerity accepts the Bible as his rule of faith, hold any different speculative view of true morality. And yet great numbers of these very persons, when they come across the throng of men, form their judgments of individual character on principles directly contrary. They profess speculatively that the truly virtuous man, in proportion as he is such, cares little for the world's praise and everything for God's; but in practice they admire far more highly one who is quick to discern and to resent misconstruction, and who is punctiliously jealous of *his own honour*. They profess speculatively that humility is among the highest of graces, and pride among the most heinous of sins; but when they are brought into contact with a truly humble man, they regard him as poor-spirited and chicken-hearted. They profess speculatively that he is most truly virtuous who ardently loves God, and is keenly sensitive of insults against His holy Name; but they rather recoil from such a man if they actually meet him, and they estimate far more highly one who has no keen sensitiveness at all for God's honour and glory, but who is genial, amiable, and kindly. Some qualities they admire as

virtues which are not virtues at all ; and others which are truly such they admire out of all due proportion. No two things can well be more different than the morality which they speculatively profess and that which they practically hold.

On no point do these two standards of morality come into more manifest conflict than on what the two parties respectively call "patriotism." In one sense of the word, patriotism is a quality which every Christian moralist will approve. A Christian father takes a special interest in the welfare of his own children, altogether apart from that with which he regards the welfare of mankind in general. He labours in a special sense that his own children may enjoy temporal and (far more) spiritual good ; and rejoices in a special sense if they do enjoy it. And in a way altogether similar, though of course far less in degree, it is at least permissible that we should take far greater interest in our own country's temporal and spiritual advancement than in that of other nations. Nay, there is a sense in which love of country is justly counted by S. Thomas as among the greatest of virtues ; that love of country, namely, which "prefers the common good to personal advantage." * Such love is exemplified wherever a citizen endures self-restraint and privation in order that he may the more largely benefit his fellow-countrymen spiritually or temporally ; that he may endow, for their service, priests, or schools, or hospitals.

But far different from this is the patriotism so admired by those whom we are now criticising. The patriotic man, according to their acceptation of the term, is more interested in his country's temporal than its spiritual good, and very far more in its external glory and greatness than in either. The patriot of this stamp takes very far greater delight in a military victory achieved by his countrymen against superior force, than in the most triumphant success obtained by a Catholic missionary towards reforming their moral practice, or the most valuable improvement of medicine or of law ; and this quite apart from the justice of his country's cause—simply through pride at her military prowess. Nay, so far as he does grieve over the national sins, it is far rather as being an element of national weakness than as being the offences of his loved fellow-countrymen against their Almighty Creator. It would be waste of time to set about proving what is so abundantly evident—viz., that patriotism in this sense is no virtue at all, but is merely one aspect of general worldliness and ungodliness.

* Amor patriæ in radice caritatis fundatur, quæ communia propriis, non propria communibus antepōnit.— *De Regimine Principum*, l. 3, c. 4.

We say, then, that when these worldly men cry aloud that the State has no concern with spiritual interests, they by no means think of excluding from its province the promotion of that morality which they practically hold, but only of that which they speculatively profess. They pursue as politicians the very same ends which they pursue as men. In fact, they express their own doctrine far too favourably when they profess to desire that government shall devote itself to the people's temporal good. Their main desire is by no means that temporal enjoyment may be diffused and temporal suffering diminished; but rather that their country may possess that great show of military power abroad, that great display of material wealth and luxury at home, which may impress both themselves and others with the idea of national greatness. It is not their country's *good* which they seek, whether spiritual or temporal, but her supposed *greatness*. Now, our position throughout has been, that though temporal good should be subordinated to spiritual, yet the pursuit of temporal good is in itself a most legitimate and laudable function of government. But we are quite unable to say so much for pursuit of national greatness, unless, indeed, it be merely sought as a *means* for national good. In national greatness we are quite unable to see anything whatever intrinsically desirable; while we see much which is full of peril to the nation's highest good. And let this also be further observed, though we have no space to enlarge on its truth and its importance: the pursuit of national good tends to international union,* but the pursuit of national greatness to international discord. It is from this very cause, from this proud and unchastened desire of national pre-eminence, that have arisen far the greater part of those desolating wars which have made so fearful an addition to human misery. So far from our holding that governments have cared *too much* for their people's temporal good, to our mind one of the most deplorable facts in all history is their having cared for it *so little*.

This, then, we believe to be the meaning of worldly and proud "patriots," when they would exclude religion from the sphere of politics. And to state such a doctrine is to refute it. No one who bears the Christian name can advocate such a principle of action nakedly and undisguisedly:

* The various discussions on free trade, if we may trust those who have studied the subject, have put in much clearer light the very interesting and pregnant truth, that (as a general rule) we thrive temporally, not by our neighbour's adversity, but by his prosperity; and that one country's industrial success is a simple benefit to other countries.

its strength lies in the multitude of worldly men who are influenced by it unconsciously and instinctively.

One explanation must be added in this place, to prevent possible misconception. We have been saying much, as our subject has suggested, on "spiritual" and "temporal" good: we have said very little on "intellectual." It might be inferred, then, that we place our ideal of national good in the people being pious on one hand, and well fed on the other; and that we regard the progress of thought and intelligence as of little account. Certainly we should no more dream of a man being personally perfect or personally admirable for possessing intellectual good than for possessing temporal. But intellectual good, no less than temporal, is a legitimate object of desire; and it admits, even more efficaciously than temporal good, of being made instrumental to the promotion of man's true end. We hold it as most desirable for a nation's welfare, not only that vigorous and manly thought shall be devoted (under the guidance of true piety) to the service of religion, but also that good Catholics shall successfully cultivate the various branches of secular science. We say this (as we observed) to avoid possible misapprehension; but we have no space for explaining and vindicating our statement.

We have now considered (we believe) all the positions differing from our own on the State's proper attitude towards religion which have been, or imaginably can be, assumed; and the obvious untenableness of every one in the number must be regarded as no weak argument for our own conclusion. From negative proof we now proceed to positive, and put before our readers some of the direct reasons available in our favour.

1. All action of the civil government is, in fact, the corporate action of the community; and this, whether the action be directed towards one of its own members, or towards some outlying body. But each member of the community is bound in some degree to aim at spiritual good, and acts more laudably in proportion as he does so in a greater degree. What good reason can be given why that aim, which is of all the most laudable in citizens acting individually, should be absolutely forbidden to them when acting corporately? If no reason can be given, nor even imagined, our own conclusion necessarily follows.

2. The second argument which we shall give comes home still more closely to the mind. It is a first principle of natural religion that we please God better the more earnestly we employ in His service every power and every influence which we possess. But the civil ruler possesses a special and wide-

spreading influence to which no other in the secular order can bear comparison. If this general rule, then, applies to others, in quite a special and pre-eminent sense it applies to him.

3. But there is a peculiarity in his relation to the people which requires to be considered separately. A master acts laudably in promoting the spiritual good of his servant; a landlord of his tenant; a manufacturer of his workman, &c., &c. Yet it can hardly be said that in these cases one party is *responsible* for the other's spiritual good, because the relation between them was freely entered into and is dissolvable at pleasure. A good Catholic, *e. g.*, in the Southern American States, would feel responsible for the spiritual good of his slaves, in a sense quite different *in kind* from that in which an English master is responsible for the spiritual good of his servants. Yet the very slaveowner is not *supreme* over his slave, not even in the temporal order; for the State government can enact laws which regulate the relations between them. But the civil ruler has been commissioned by God to wield a physical power which is absolutely irresistible through the length and breadth of the entire land. This power has been given him for their benefit, and they are under the strict obligation of rendering hearty obedience to his just commands. It is impossible that any one of ordinary piety can be in such a position as this in regard to a great number of men, without feeling himself most deeply responsible for the promotion of their highest good.

4. And the case becomes far stronger when we consider how absolutely impossible it is that he can be neutral in regard to their spiritual welfare. We will first establish this fact, and afterwards draw out the very cogent argument which results from it. We say, then, that the civil governor cannot be spiritually neutral; that his inaction will necessarily have quite as important a moral bearing as any course of action which he can possibly adopt. There will be no space to state one hundredth part of the facts which will illustrate this proposition; but there will be ample space to prove its truth abundantly and irrefragably. And we will take our illustrations from our own country, because the instances will thus be more familiar to our readers, and will more readily convey their due force.

We may begin our survey of the State's necessary moral influence almost from the moment of a child's birth. Some months ago, a highminded and benevolent Protestant gentleman, who signs himself "S. G. O.," addressed a letter to the *Times* on what he called the "guilt-gardens" of London. His position was substantially this: "In consequence of land-owners and builders being placed under no sufficient restric-

tion in the pursuit of their own advantage, numbers of the London poor are driven into abodes most fatal to their moral interests. The squalid wretchedness of these courts is the least of their evils; their moral atmosphere is more stifling and deadly than their physical. The miserable children born there are under a certain quasi-necessity of growing up in the deepest moral darkness; their minds are utterly corrupted, even before the age of reason and education begins." It is no business of ours to inquire whether this statement is exaggerated; though we have no reason to believe that it is so. Such a state of things, at all events, is abundantly possible in any large town; nor is it denied that evils of a similar kind, though less in degree, may easily be rife in the country also. Further, the evil is one which no private benevolence can possibly remedy: the Legislature, and that alone, can arrest the plague, whether by interposing some further restraint on landowners and builders, or by exercising forcible interference in some other way. Our position, then, is, that on this matter the Legislature cannot possibly be neutral; that its *inaction* is a fact as momentous in its bearing on moral and spiritual interests as any imaginable mode of action can possibly be.

The child, in due time, reaches the age when reason begins to dawn. What education shall he receive? The government, by absolute necessity, must take one or other of the three following courses. Firstly, it may be altogether inactive in the whole matter, and even refuse giving effect to any endowment from individuals. In that case no external help will be available for educational purposes, except so much as the zeal and resources of any religious or irreligious body may furnish, as it were, from day to day. So far as this help does not extend, the poor will educate their children just as much and just as little as they can and will; the wicked will train their children in vice, and the unbelieving in unbelief. Secondly, the State may be itself inactive, but may not refuse giving effect to private educational endowments. In this case it will have to decide whether it shall give effect to all such endowments, or only to some. Shall it sanction endowments, *e. g.*, to educate children in atheism and socialism? If not, where shall the line be drawn? Shall it exclude Deistic endowments? or Unitarian? or Catholic? or shall it include all these? It cannot possibly avoid facing this question, if it sanctions endowments at all. Or, thirdly, the government may not only sanction endowments, but it may itself move actively in the matter: it may give largely from the public purse; nay, it may actually enforce a certain amount of educational training, both moral and intellectual. Any one of these three courses is pregnant

with most important results, favourable or unfavourable, to the people's spiritual good; yet the government, by logical necessity, must embrace one or other.

The child grows up to maturity, and thinks of settling in life. Here we are brought to that vitally important function of civil government which we have already mentioned—the determining what law of marriage it shall sanction and promote. And in this instance, again, the State cannot be spiritually neutral. It must sanction one marriage law or other, as we have already shown; and whichever it sanctions, most momentous results will ensue as regards the nation's moral and spiritual advancement.

Then, again, as to that particular class of offences which is specially opposed to the sanctity of marriage. The State cannot ignore them; it must deal with them one way or another. And however it deals with them, moral interests will be deeply affected for good or for evil. Consider again the publication of immoral books, &c. The inaction of government here is something very different from spiritual neutrality: it means that such productions may circulate freely among all classes of the community.

We have now said enough, we hope, to suggest a train of thought which will lead the reader much farther. At all events we have said enough, and much more than enough, to establish our proposition. The argument built on that proposition may be stated as follows:—The civil governor, we have seen, cannot escape from spiritual responsibility: do what he will, his conduct must by absolute necessity affect, for good or for evil, the highest interests of those placed by God under his rule. Now suppose he were consistently to exclude spiritual ends from all share in determining his policy. No one will be so wild as to say that by a happy accident, while aiming at mere temporal good, he will invariably, or even ordinarily, achieve spiritual. It follows, therefore, that if he did not aim at spiritual good, he would seriously prejudice it. But our opponents maintain that God has commanded him not to aim at it; and we see therefore the issue of their theory. It comes to this: that God has commissioned him to wield an irresistible physical power over his countrymen; and has strictly commanded him to use that power in opposition to the reign of God Himself within their souls. No one who believes in God at all, will venture to accept such a conclusion as this.

Here, however, a few words must be interposed to prevent our being misunderstood. There is no reason whatever, we have said, for expecting that he who aims exclusively at temporal good will ordinarily effect spiritual. But the converse by no means follows; and it may well be thought, that by aiming at

spiritual good the ruler will more effectually secure temporal than in any other possible way : according to that Scripture, " Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added to you." This indeed is Gregory XVI.'s judgment, in that passage from his Encyclical on which we have rested throughout.

5. Our last argument shall be built on the consent of all who are in any sense religiously earnest, Catholic or non-Catholic. Can a single case be found where the theory which we oppose has been practically adopted by any civil ruler who was himself deeply impressed with the immeasurable pre-eminence of spirituals over temporals ? Can any case be found, *e. g.*, where a zealous Catholic, being a member of Parliament, will refuse to promote a grant for Catholic education, however convinced he may be that the Church's interests will be thereby advanced, until he have first satisfied himself that such a measure will promote the temporal welfare of Great Britain and Ireland ? Is anything like this even practically imaginable ? Consider again the labours of several Catholic members, for which the whole Catholic body is so grateful, in behalf of our poor in workhouses and prisons. Such labours were, of course, directed expressly to the spiritual good of that oppressed class. Who is there to maintain that these members *ipso facto* transgressed the bounds prescribed by God to their political action ? The theory which we are opposing, then, is a mere theory, which no ruler really interested in the advancement of spirituals could dream of carrying into action.

Having now argued both negatively and positively in behalf of our conclusion, it is time to consider the objections which have been, or imaginably may be, adduced in opposition ; and it will be found that their consideration throws increased light on our meaning and adds increased strength to our reasoning.

1. The first objection comes from Catholics, and may be stated thus : God has founded the Church for the express purpose of promoting man's spiritual welfare : the State, therefore, can have no such end. The reply to this is most obvious, if we will take the analogy suggested by Gregory XVI.—that of parents.* It might be quite as reasonably argued : The priest is entrusted by God with the child's spiritual training, and the parent therefore has no such office. Yet how indignant should we be at any such allegation, and how ready with our reply ! We should argue, triumphantly, that the priest's office not only has not superseded the parent's spiritual duty,

* *Positi quasi parentes et tutores populorum.*—*Encyclical.*
VOL. I.—NO. I. [*New Series.*] H

but that it has not even lessened it; what it has done is to fix that duty in one definite and cognizable direction. A parent, as such, is entrusted with the promotion of her child's highest good: the Catholic parent knows precisely what is the nature of that good, and what the appointed means of its attainment. The Catholic parent, we say, fulfils her duty to her child's soul, by bringing him into close relation with the priests of God, and educating him in a strict subordination to the Church's authority and guidance. And it is on the same principles—however great the difference of application—that a Catholic prince will confer spiritual benefits on those subject to his civil jurisdiction.

2. To the preceding analogy, however, it may be replied, and we may count this as a second objection, that the parent is concerned with those whose reason is immature, and that no authority can rightly be entrusted with the spiritual training of *adults*, unless it be specially endowed with that Divine Light which will enable it clearly to discover its way. We reply as follows:—We have already admitted, on this very ground, that the civil government has no right of directly moral and religious legislation. The parent has the right of such legislation over children, but the State has no such right over adult citizens. What we contend for is that the *civil governor* should promote his country's spiritual good by his *political measures*, through methods of the very same kind as those through which an individual would promote it in his *personal action*. And this being understood, it is plain that the present objection does not even touch the case of a Catholic ruler, for the counsels and guidance of the Church are as accessible to him in his political as in his personal capacity. But even as to a non-Catholic ruler the objection cannot gravely be maintained, unless it be also asserted that no non-Catholic, even as an individual, should aim directly at his neighbour's moral welfare. We have no wish at all to overrate the moral discernment of non-Catholics; but surely any one of them is far more likely to promote moral good by constantly labouring for that end, than by being wholly indifferent on the subject. We may add, also, that by this course he will ever be improving his own moral perception.

There is but one difficulty in the matter which is even plausible—the case, namely, of a non-Catholic government using its influence in opposition to the true faith. We have already referred to this difficulty, and engaged to treat it in a subsequent article. It cannot be handled satisfactorily—no one will think so,—unless it be considered in some detail, and therefore at some length.

3. A third objection has been made, also from a Catholic quarter: The State was anterior to the Catholic Church, and cannot, therefore, owe her deference and allegiance. In a Catholic's mouth, surely this statement is somewhat strange. Was not morality anterior to the Christian Church? And are we, on that account, at liberty to deny that the Church's exposition of morality demands our interior assent? But, indeed, the objection is so obviously fallacious, that a very few words will suffice in reply. In every age, indeed in every state of society, in virtue of the natural law itself, a civil governor acts more laudably in proportion as he more efficaciously directs his temporal administration to the people's highest good. But the establishment of the Catholic Church has enabled him to know certainly wherein that good exists; and has also taught him that he cannot satisfactorily promote it except by acting, and by inducing his subjects to act, in subordination to her Divine authority.

4. Another objection is suggested by Lord Macaulay's criticism on Mr. Gladstone. "Look at banks, insurance-offices, dock companies, canal companies, gas companies, hospitals, dispensaries. Can we gravely say," Lord Macaulay seems to ask, "that the managers of these various associations act more laudably in proportion as they aim at the spiritual good of their various members? Or would not such an attempt be rather a simple impertinence and injustice?" In answering this, for clearness' sake we will take one particular instance, that of a hospital; and what we say in this case may easily be extended over the whole catalogue. To bring out sharply the point at issue, we will suppose that this hospital is supported indiscriminately by persons of every religious denomination; and that by some strange accident a number of zealous Catholics form a majority of the governing body. The objection is, that if a Catholic ruler may devote public money to the promotion of his country's spiritual welfare, on the same principle these Catholics may similarly apply the corporate money with which they are entrusted. The reply is most obvious. They have been entrusted with this money for one purpose, and it is simple robbery if they apply it to any other. The parallel breaks down in the very particular which alone is relevant. The governing body of a hospital derives its authority from the subscribers; but the governing body of a nation derives its authority from God: taxpayers, as such, being under it, not over it. In a constitutional government like ours, many taxpayers, no doubt, have votes in electing members of parliament; but so far as regards this most limited function, they form a part of the government itself. Once

admit that the civil governor is a mere delegate, hired and employed by the taxpayers, there is no dearth, certainly, of frightful consequences which would follow from so detestable a premiss; but it is a premiss which every good Catholic abhors. We must recur to this under the next head of objection, and we will here therefore say no more.

The Catholic governors of such a hospital, therefore, cannot without robbery employ any of the corporate money to the promotion of Catholicism; neither can they without breach of trust employ their authority in that direction. But so far as is consistent with observing these strict obligations, they should consult the spiritual good both of subscribers and of patients. Thus, it is often very possible, without at all diminishing the hospital's efficiency in its proper work, to allow far greater time and facility for visits from the various religious ministers; and this the Catholic managers may most laudably effect. Or there may be this or that hospital arrangement more or less adverse to morality, and this they may be even bound to alter. In one word, they will act laudably by performing (in their official capacity) every service towards the spiritual good of those with whom they are brought into relation, except so far as they are debarred from such service by the conditions which those who delegated their office have expressly or interpretatively affixed to its exercise.

Another point of difference between the two cases should not be omitted. The civil governor, as we have seen, cannot be spiritually neutral; but the associations enumerated by Lord Macaulay are so altogether, as a general rule. Suppose the case to be otherwise; suppose, *e.g.*, that in some hospital priests were refused reasonable access to Catholic patients. In that case, if no redress could be obtained, Catholics might be bound, not only to retire from the management, but to withdraw their subscriptions.

5. Let us next consider the objection which we incidentally touched upon in discussing the last. It may be objected that the governor of a State is a delegate of the citizens, just as the governor of a hospital is a delegate of the subscribers; that the citizens employ or hire him for temporal, not spiritual work; and consequently that it is breach of trust if he uses his political influence, and actual robbery if he devotes public money, for any except a temporal purpose.

We reply, in the first place, that this doctrine (the sovereignty of the people) is simply revolutionary and anti-Catholic. We maintain it to be a most certain and sacred truth, that God has immediately instituted civil government, with all its intrinsic rights and functions, whatever they may

be;* and that He has commanded all individual citizens to obey such government, as invested with His own authority. The best Catholic, no doubt, may utterly repudiate the divine right of kings as such, whether Stuarts or Bourbons. The best Catholic may hold that God gives no preference to one form of government over another, and that He has not (by His own immediate act) placed the reins of government in the hands of one rather than of another; nay, that in certain exceptional cases the collective people may legitimately nominate to the vacant sovereignty. But in holding such opinions, he will, no less cordially than other Catholics, abhor that revolutionary maxim above recited, which gives rise to the present objection.† The question, however, is too vital, especially under present circumstances, to be treated episodically; and we hope in an early number to argue at length against the revolutionary theory, on grounds of reason no less than authority.

But, secondly, we could never understand how this monstrous theory, even were it true, would affect our present argument. As to the great majority of European countries, if the citizens now living ever did delegate to their present rulers a power of government, this act of delegacy took place *in nubibus*, and its records are deposited in the same inaccessible region. Consequently, in regard to what was then delegated, I have as much right to my opinion as you have to yours. You say that the citizens entrusted the civil ruler only with the care of their temporal interests. I have just as much right to say that they also entrusted him with the care of their moral and spiritual advancement. Or rather, I have more to say for my opinion than you for yours; because no government can be spiritually neutral, and we must not pay them the bad compliment of supposing that they deliberately desired a sacrifice of their higher good to their lower.‡

* *Suprema potestas civilis, per se spectata, immediatè data est a Deo.*—*Suarez, "Defensio Fidei Catholicæ,"* l. 3, c. 2.

Observandum est, "politicam potestatem in universum consideratam . . . immediatè esse a solo Deo."—*Bellarmino.*

† The contrast between the revolutionary doctrine of popular sovereignty, and any doctrine which has been advocated by Catholic theologians, is very clearly and forcibly, though briefly, stated in one of our earlier numbers. See DUBLIN REVIEW, vol. xxviii. p. 293, note.

We have nowhere seen the whole question (to our mind) so satisfactorily treated as in Mgr. Parisis's work, "*La Démocratie devant l'Enseignement Catholique.*" We may also warmly recommend Dr. Murray's essay in the fourth volume of the "*Annual Miscellany.*"

‡ Chaque individu veut que la société protège spécialement ce qu'il a de plus cher et de plus précieux. Mais est-il rien de plus précieux pour

Then, thirdly, let us even assume, for argument's sake, that men have everywhere personally and freely hired their respective rulers; and have delegated to them no other power than the preservation of exterior peace: we maintain that such delegacy would have been *ipso facto* null and void, and incapable therefore of standing as a foundation for duties. If the ruler do not directly consult his people's spiritual interests, he will certainly injure them. Now, no men have a right to entrust another with a power which will necessarily be injurious to their own highest good.*

6. The remaining objection we have purposely reserved to the last, that by answering it we may finally complete our abstract theoretical statement. It may be said, then, that the common sense of mankind regards temporal good as the State's proper end; nay, and that we ourselves have admitted as much in the earlier part of our article.

In that part of our article we were speaking of the immediate end for which God instituted civil government; and we will here repeat in substance what we there affirmed. God, in originally instituting civil government, contemplated (if we may so express ourselves) as His immediate end the preservation of exterior peace; and as His ultimate end, the various benefits, both spiritual and temporal, which flow from such peace. To this statement we most entirely adhere; we only say that it does not exhaust the subject. Exterior peace cannot be secured unless the ruler have at his disposal irresistible physical force; and this circumstance brings him into various intimate relations with his people, from which flow *incidentally*, by the very natural law, certain obligations and counsels in regard both to their spiritual and temporal welfare. These obligations and counsels (we say) are from God himself; and yet they are not included in the primary end (whether immediate or ultimate) for which He instituted civil government. Such seems to us the true mode of harmonizing various propositions which at first seem inconsistent; and we will proceed, therefore, to draw two somewhat important inferences from this fundamental principle.

l'individu et pour une nation que la religion elle-meme ? Que de fois ne voit-on pas des peuples défendre leur religion avec plus de persistance et de dévouement que leur propre indépendance politique ? Quand on veut exprimer en deux mots le caractère d'une lutte suprême, on dit qu'il combat "pro aris et focis,"—*l'autel avant le foyer*.—*M. l'Abbé Godard, "Les Principes de '89,"* p. 16.

* The community has no power to confer [a right] unless so far as it harmonizes with the law of God and their own spiritual and temporal well-being.—*Murray On Education*, p. 310.

Firstly, the preservation of exterior peace is the ruler's one primary function. It is of strict obligation. Nay, if he signally fails to preserve exterior peace, he forfeits his claim to the very title of civil governor.

Secondly, since God's immediate end in the institution is a certain temporal good, we cannot be surprised to find that the State has far greater intrinsic aptitude for the promotion of man's temporal than his spiritual welfare. Thus a country's advancement in material wealth is no more included in the primary function of civil government, than is her advancement in piety and love of God; and yet the ruler, so far as he acts by his own light and with his own proper instruments, has indefinitely more power towards the lower end than towards the higher. A good Catholic who has any share in civil government feels this most keenly. On questions, *e.g.*, of free trade or currency, he proceeds in the last resort on his own discretion and responsibility; but where moral and spiritual good is concerned, he feels deeply that his only true attitude is that of subordination to the Church's guidance and authority.

And if we suppose the case of a ruler inculpably non-Catholic, the truth of our statement will but emerge more clearly. Such a ruler, if pious and conscientious, would unquestionably direct his political measures in great degree to the people's spiritual good; and yet, in the very fact of doing so, he would receive the strongest practical impression that he is, as we may say, out of his depth. He finds that the knowledge to which he has access, and the resources which he has at command, are fully adequate to the promotion of temporal good in some important branches. But he would be reminded, at every turn, that in working for moral and spiritual good, or for those kinds of temporal good which are inseparably bound up therewith, he is attempting a task above his powers. We are far from meaning that he should not make the attempt, and we are far from denying that real and important benefits would result from his making it; but we maintain confidently that the more steadily he should apply himself to that end, so much the more keenly would he feel his urgent need of support from some authority higher, more spiritual, more specially Divine, than his own. It is impossible here to explain our meaning with any fulness; but in a future article the whole subject will recur.

We see, then, that there is more than one sense in which temporal good, as distinct from spiritual, is the civil governor's proper work. The immediate end for which God instituted his office is temporal; his one primary function, and the only one whose positive fulfilment is of strict obliga-

tion, is temporal;* and so long as he is restricted to his own proper intelligence and his own proper instruments, he cannot work with due and satisfactory effectiveness for an end higher than temporal.

And yet, on the whole, the office of civil governor, in its own nature and idea, is venerable and sacred; and we regard it as among the calamities of our time that there are so many countries in which this doctrine is but little acknowledged, whether by governors or governed. Its primary function—the preservation of exterior peace—is in itself no doubt temporal; yet that very temporal function is of vital importance to the spiritual order, and he who faithfully fulfils it confers an invaluable benefit on souls. The administration of justice, again, and the infliction of capital punishment,—these are no *incidents* of civil government: they are indispensable means to the immediate end of its institution; and how prominently do they exhibit the secular authority as a visible representative to the nation of God's Eternal Justice! Lastly, any civil governor, without travelling at all beyond his proper sphere, has considerable opportunities of advancing moral and spiritual good, and fulfils his office better in proportion as he takes more advantage thereof; while, in the case of a Catholic ruler, acting with deference and subordination to the Church, such opportunities are of value almost incalculable. And if it be thought that the miserable secularity of aim which has ever disgraced the great majority of governments makes such declarations unadvisable, we assert the very contrary. That a ruler shall recognize the intrinsic sacredness of his office, is the first step towards his fulfilling it in a less unworthy spirit. Nor can it be too often remembered that the emperor was heathen, and among the worst even of his class, when the apostles spoke so strongly on the divine character and authority of the "*potestates sublimiores*." Every one must be struck with the spirit of reverence towards civil government which such passages breathe.

It only remains, so far as our present article is concerned, to speak of the ecclesiastical testimony to our doctrine. And so far as the question relates to the religious functions of a Catholic ruler in dealing with his Catholic subjects, a very few words will suffice. The declaration, indeed, of Gregory XVI., on

* If the ruler is sluggish in pursuing spiritual good, or temporal good other than protection of person and property, he acts less laudably; but he does not necessarily violate a strict obligation. His *obligations* in regard to spiritual good are very far more negative than positive.

which we have rested throughout, is so clear and unequivocal that nothing can possibly be more so. He tells Catholic princes that their authority is given to them even more for the protection of the Church than for the governance of the world; that the cause of faith should be dearer to them than that of their own rule; and that their chief care should be the security of religion. Every sentence tells against those who hold that the temporal ruler, when a Catholic, transgresses his province if he directly aim at supernatural good in his temporal administration.

We had intended here to multiply authorities by citing (1) the office for a king's coronation; (2) the universal approbation given by the Church to the pious zeal of Catholic emperors; and (3) the statements of individual theologians. But as there cannot by possibility be a difference of opinion on the matter, and as our article has already run to too great a length, we will forbear. It is more necessary to consider a question on which there is some apparent room for divergency of opinion, and which is not without considerable practical importance. It is absolutely certain, on grounds of authority, that a Catholic prince acts legitimately and laudably in promoting the spiritual good of his Catholic people. But two different theories are imaginable, as foundations for this admitted conclusion. It may be thought, on the one hand, that such a function is inherent in his office; or, on the other hand, that it is exercised by him only in virtue of some delegation from the Church. For ourselves, we do not indeed at all deny the Church's power to delegate such authority, were such delegation necessary, for, as we have already said, we avoid in this article the whole question. But we maintain that such delegation is *not* necessary; for that the function of promoting his people's spiritual good appertains to a Catholic prince in virtue of his office. Now, in taking this alternative, we are met by an apparent difficulty. Civil government existed long before the Catholic Church; and civil authority is still exercised by many who have never heard of that Church. If the function, then, of promoting spiritual good be inherent in the office of a Catholic prince, it must be in virtue of some more general principle, which includes this as a particular case. Nor can any such general principle be imagined except that which we have throughout advocated—viz., that the civil ruler (Catholic or non-Catholic) acts more laudably in proportion as he more energetically pursues his people's highest good, so far as he is cognisant of such good. This being premised, it will be seen that the issue resolves itself into this. Those whom we follow, hold that the Catholic prince's function of promoting spiritual good is entrusted to

him immediately by God. Our opponents, on the contrary, maintain that this function accrues to him in no other way than by delegation from the Church; and that apart from such delegation it would not appertain to him at all. As far as argument goes, we have reasoned throughout in favour of our own alternative; the present question is, on which side stands Catholic authority.

Gregory XVI.'s words in themselves are absolutely decisive. That pontiff, adopting the expression of his predecessor S. Leo the Great, declares that the authority of Catholic princes has been conferred on them, not only for the governance of the world, but chiefly for the protection of the Church. He speaks then of some Giver as having conferred on them this power for two ends; the higher end being the chief one. He cannot possibly be speaking of the Church as that giver; for no one maintains that it is the Church which delegates to a king his authority "for the *government of the world*." It follows, therefore, that, in Gregory XVI.'s judgment, God himself conferred on princes the function of protecting the Church. And the Pope continues in a similar strain. He exhorts princes to make the security of religion their chief end, on the ground of their "position" as "parents and tutors of their [respective] peoples." But this "position" is assigned to them by God himself, not by the Church; and it follows, therefore, that God himself has given them the office of labouring for the security of religion.

Those whom we have called throughout our "theological opponents" have one theological ground, and (we think) only one, for their view; but that ground, we most fully admit, is at first glance an extremely strong one. They rest on the very definite and explicit statement, made repeatedly by Suarez and other theologians, that the end of civil government is not moral and spiritual good, but exclusively temporal. If we are able to show, however, that these theologians do not really deny any part of the doctrine which we have advocated, the whole question of authority must be decided in our favour. And we consider that we *are* able to show this satisfactorily and irrefragably.

But before approaching Suarez, let us say a few words on S. Thomas. His work "*De Regimine Principum*" is a political, not a theological, treatise; which makes it the more remarkable how consistently and undeviatingly he assigns to the civil government, as its chief function, the promotion of God's service and worship. Thus, in the passage already cited (note to p. 79), he says, "*It pertains to the office of king to effect that the life of the multitude shall be good, in accordance*

with what is suitable for the attainment of heavenly beatitude" (l. i., c. 15). And elsewhere even more expressly he speaks of "divine worship, towards which kings and princes should aim with their whole endeavour and anxiety, as towards their due end." (l. ii., c. 16. See the original quoted in note to p. 78). Nay, as if to show still more clearly that he is not speaking of any power delegated by the Church, he extends his remarks to "every monarchy [which has existed] from the beginning of the world." * From this, one conclusion at all events follows. Even though it had been true that Suarez and other theologians teach differently, we should have had to choose between their authority on one side and S. Thomas's on the other.

Suarez's teaching, however, does not, in fact, at all diverge from S. Thomas's. He frequently says, indeed (we fully admit it), that the civil power does not regard spiritual good here, nor eternal felicity hereafter, as its proper end, whether proximate or ultimate;† but only the temporal good of the community. Nor can we at all wonder that such a mode of speech should be regarded by our opponents as decisive in their sense. Their obvious argument may be this: If the end of civil government be exclusively temporal good, the ruler (unless he receive some delegated power from the Church) transgresses his prescribed province, and in fact violates a strict obligation, if in his political measures he directly pursues a spiritual and supernatural end. We are quite confident, however, that Suarez's doctrine is totally different from this. And we will give our opponents their greatest possible advantage by confining our argument to that very chapter in which Suarez states, more emphatically than anywhere else, the proposition on which they rely. We refer to the eleventh chapter of his third book, "De Legibus." We will first show that it cannot possibly bear the sense which they affix to it; and, secondly, we will explain what we believe him to have really meant. They, on their side, will of course concede to us the indubitable fact, that throughout this chapter he is speaking of functions intrinsically appertaining to the civil governor, and that he is not supposing any delegation from the Church.

First, then, if we will but believe Suarez's express words in this very chapter, it is absolutely certain that he raises no objection (but very much the contrary) against the civil governor

* In quâlibet monarchiâ ab initio sæculi tria se invicem per ordinem comitata sunt: divinus cultus, sapientia scholastica, et secularis potentia.

† For instance: "Potestas civilis et jus civile per se non respiciunt æternam felicitatem supernaturalem vitæ futuræ tanquam finem proprium vel proximum vel ultimum."—*De Legibus*, l. iii., c. 11, n. 4.

pursuing a supernatural end in his policy and legislation. He says expressly that "Catholic legislators, in enacting their laws, *may, and in part ought, to regard the supernatural end.*"* He further lays it down, that a Catholic prince is actually under the *obligation* "of commanding nothing through this [civil] power which is contrary to the supernatural end, or *may impede its attainment.*"† But if this be so, a Catholic prince, *as prince*, is *bound* to consider his people's supernatural good with no small degree of "circumspection" and attention. Suarez, however, goes further than this. He quotes, with complete approbation, S. Augustine's words concerning Catholic emperors: "We account them happy if they make their power a servant to His Majesty, *for the purpose of spreading as widely as possible the worship of God.*" He cites, with no less approval, S. Leo's praise of Theodosius, because the latter "showed not only a royal but also a sacerdotal mind; and because he laboured to avert heresies and schisms." He merely adds the caution, that this *positive* promotion of supernatural interests by the civil government is ordinarily a matter, not of precept, but of counsel.‡ Nothing can bring into stronger light the contrast between Suarez's doctrine and that of our opponents. Let us suppose the case of a Catholic prince who adopts some political measure, avowedly and exclusively, for the sake of a supernatural end; who devotes public money, *e.g.*, to the support of certain priests, simply for the sake of the good thence accruing to souls. And let us further suppose that there is no question at all of any delegation of authority from the Church. What shall we say of his act? "He is

* Licet ipsi legislatores fideles in suis legibus ferendis, intueri possint, et ex parte debeant, supernaturalem finem.—*De Legibus*, l. iii., c. 11, n. 9.

† Per circumspectionem nihil statuendi per hanc potestatem, quod sit contrarium fini supernaturali *vel ejus consecrationem impedire possit*. Quæ observantia . . . est non tantum in consilio sed *etiam in præcepto* maxime proprio Christiani ac Catholici principis.—n. 11.

‡ "Hanc finem [temporalem] semper intendit ipsa [civilis] potestas quatenus talis est; licet utens illā possit *perfectius* operari. Et hoc modo Leo papa laudat Theodosium, quod . . . non solum regium animum sed etiam sacerdotalem ostenderet, et quod curam haberet avertendi hæreses et schismata" (n. 10). "Legislatio civilis . . . actio honesta est . . . ergo est de se *apta referri ad finem supernaturalem*. Ergo princeps Christianus facile potest *in eam finem illam dirigere, et optime faciet illam referendo*, juxta illud Augustini, ubi de regibus Christianis sit: 'Felices eos dicimus, si suam potestatem ad Dei cultum maxime dilatandum majestati Ejus famulam faciunt' . . . Est autem observandum, hanc relationem posse dupliciter fieri; primo *per positivam ordinationem*; et sic regulariter *erit in consilio*, nisi ubi speciale præceptum, vel necessitas *ad illam obligaverit* . . . Secundo intelligi potest per negationem tantum, seu per circumspectionem nihil statuendi," etc., as just now quoted.—n. 11.

violating an obligation," say our opponents; "he is fulfilling a counsel," says Suarez.

What then is Suarez's meaning, here and in other places, when he insists so much on the end of civil government as being merely temporal good? We reply, he is speaking throughout of the class of acts which the civil ruler has authority to command, and the class of offences which he has authority to punish.* The analysis of his argument is this: "The end for which God instituted civil government is temporal good; † the ruler therefore has been entrusted with no other kind of authority except such as is requisite for that end. He may command his subjects to pay taxes, or to serve in the army; he may not command them (on his own authority) to frequent the sacraments and be regular at mass. He may punish them for robbery or murder; he may not punish them (unless the Church delegates to him spiritual jurisdiction) for eating meat on abstinence days, or for heresy. Such, then, and such only, is the authority with which God has entrusted him: it is temporal, and not spiritual. Nevertheless, he is under the obligation of not so exercising this temporal authority as to impede his people in attaining their supernatural end. Still further, he acts more perfectly and more according to counsel, in proportion as he more defers to the maxims of S. Augustine and S. Leo; in proportion as he more closely imitates the great Theodosius; in proportion (that is) as he more energetically devotes his temporal authority to the advancement of spirituals." This is a most definite and intelligible theory; and if we accept it as the clue to Suarez's meaning, we shall find that the whole chapter hangs together most naturally and consistently. For ourselves, we are not prepared to maintain that his reasoning is throughout satisfactory; but the conclusions at which he arrives, the whole doctrine which he lays down on the relation of civil government to spiritual good, is, in all essential particulars, identical with that advocated in the preceding pages.

And whenever scholastic theologians dwell on the proposition

* "*Dico, potestatem hanc civilem non extendi in materiâ vel actibus suis ad finem supernaturalem,*" are his words.

† There are two points on which we have ventured to differ from Suarez here. Firstly, we consider that the immediate end for which civil government was instituted, is not temporal good in general, but one particular part of it—viz., the protection of person and property. Secondly, we consider that the ultimate end contemplated by God in the primary institution, is not temporal good only, but, much more, moral and spiritual—viz., all the moral and spiritual good which flows from security of person and property.

that civil government was instituted for a temporal end, they do so invariably (as we confidently maintain) in reference to the class of acts which the prince has authority to command and to punish. Nothing can be more alien from their whole structure of thought, from their express assertions and their undeviating implications, than the notion that a Catholic prince transgresses his intrinsic province by directing temporal authority to spiritual good.

It so happens that a recent publication furnishes us with an excellent indication of the Church's mind on this whole matter. An excellent French priest, M. Godard, put out a little volume two years ago on the *Principles of '89*. It was promptly placed on the Index, and as promptly revoked by the author. He at once proceeded to Rome, and put himself into communication with the most accredited theologians; and the result has been a second edition of his work, guaranteed by them as in no respect open to theological censure. We may be pretty sure, then, that if there be any important statement contained in the first edition, but omitted and contradicted in the second, such statement was accounted censurable by the Roman authorities. Now, in the condemned edition, M. Godard referred to the opinion, as tolerated among Catholics, that the sovereign's authority should not be directed to a spiritual end, but exclusively to a temporal one. In the approved edition, however, he speaks most differently, and implies that those who hold such an opinion are censurable. For himself he adds these remarkable words: "Although spiritual good in this life and eternal felicity in the next are not the immediate end of civil society, yet it ought to be *organized and directed as far as possible* in such a manner as to *guide the individual towards his true end*, to which *all the rest should be subordinated*. . . . The individual claims at the hands of society aid and protection to arrive at the absolute good, the supreme end of his existence."*

Here then for the present we close our argument, having completed indeed our abstract theoretical statement. In an early number (though not in the very next) we hope to

* Quoique le bien spirituel ici bas et la félicité de l'autre vie ne soient pas le but immédiat de la société civile, elle doit être néanmoins organisée et dirigée autant que possible de manière à conduire l'individu vers la fin dernière, à laquelle il faut subordonner tout le reste. . . . L'individu . . . réclame de la société aide et protection, pour arriver au bien absolu, but suprême de son existence.—*Principes de '89*, p. 152.

The excellent author of this work died, very soon after its appearance, at an early age, and to the deep regret of all who knew him.

resume the subject ; for we have yet to treat the practical application of our theory. We have still to consider what relations, in fact, would exist between the ecclesiastical and civil governments, whenever both should duly perform their proper functions. We have further to meet the obvious objection that our theory would go far to justify Protestant governments in adopting a policy of injustice and persecution towards the Catholic Church. Lastly, we must apply our general theory to the special circumstances of the present time, and in particular to the case of a Catholic having part in the Legislature of these islands. We heartily regret that we have no room here to enter on these momentous discussions ; for we are well aware that there is at last no method of testing theoretical truth which is so good and satisfactory as that of considering in detail its practical application.

A few further remarks on the subject treated in this article, will be found in the first of our "Notices of Books."

ART. IV.—ROSA FERRUCCI.

Rosa Ferrucci: ses Lettres et sa Mort. Par l'Abbé Henri Perreyve. Paris : Douniol, 1858.

IT has been matter of surprise to us that so remarkable a work as the "Life and Letters of Rosa Ferrucci," although published both in Italian* and French, has remained so little known amongst us. In these days, when men are anxious both to range great Italian names on the side of rebellion and schism, and to prove that the Italy of the past was unable to foster education and genius, it is well to draw attention to a collection of writings which so abundantly refutes the assertion.

Rosa Ferrucci was a very gifted being ; she possessed natural talents of the highest order, and she had also the advantage of wise parents, who knew how to direct and cultivate the remarkable powers of her mind. Her father was a professor in the University of Pisa, and her mother an authoress of some celebrity. Rosa was taught well and learnt well. At six years old she could read Italian, French, and German.

* *Rosa Ferrucci, e alcuni suoi Scritti, pubblicati per cura di sua madre.* Florence : 1857. A second edition, which appeared in 1858, has been enriched with additional matter at the express desire of Mgr. Charvaz, Archbishop of Genoa.

At a more advanced age she knew the whole "*Divina Commedia*" of Dante by heart. She was also an excellent Latin scholar,—studying, however, under her mother's careful eye,—and was well read in the standard authors, as well of her own country as of England, France, and Germany. She kept up a correspondence in three languages—French, German, and Italian—in the latter, chiefly with her betrothed. Each collection of letters is remarkable; but the object of her biographer having been to give a portrait of the sweetness, purity, and holiness of this young girl—a portrait unconsciously furnished by herself—rather than to display her mental gifts, it is these alone of which his translation enables us to judge. To her solid acquirements she added great proficiency in music, for which she was distinguished even in that land of music. At seventeen she was, in short, a highly educated and accomplished woman.

But Rosa Ferrucci, with all her abilities and all her learning, was very far removed in character as well from those "strong-minded," self-reliant women who, valuing themselves on their mental superiority and rare acquirements, imagine they have a mission to reform society, as from that more numerous class who delight in a vain display of their brilliant but frivolous accomplishments. Her French biographer, the Abbé Perreyve, who was personally acquainted with her family and with herself, observes that her education would almost have entitled a man to rank among the learned. Her rare mental gifts, however, being beside the object he has in view, a recurrence to them would interrupt his more important and edifying theme. He contents himself, therefore, with observing, once for all, that having spent several months in close intercourse with her excellent family, he can bear witness to the child-like modesty of this extraordinary girl; a modesty which she not only never outstepped, but which taught her to be ingenious in the art of self-concealment. "I leave, then, on one side," he adds, "all that relates to this intellectual culture and taste for classical learning, which took so pure and exalted a form in this young Christian maiden. Understood and accepted in Italy, such literary habits would be reckoned strange in France, where there exists an extravagant fear of anything which tends to raise a woman's mind above a certain intellectual level. I prefer, therefore, after this necessary allusion to them, to limit my notice to the saintly virtues of this young girl."

Undoubtedly, her literary eminence is of very secondary moment. It is as an example of the all-absorbing love of God and of perfection in a young soul, while as yet the prospects of earth had all the freshness of spring and the promise of

summer, that Rosa Ferrucci comes before us. To dwell much upon her mental endowments in presence of the spiritual beauty of her soul would indeed be a mistake. The two excellences are of course not comparable; and to talk long of Rosa Ferrucci the accomplished scholar, is to forget, or to cast into the shade, Rosa Ferrucci the exalted Christian. Yet we conceive that there is one great advantage in keeping in view the combination of the two characters; and it may be well to pause awhile to consider the unusual phenomenon she exhibited: a young girl, possessing talents and acquirements which would almost have entitled her to a professor's chair, yet distinguished by a retiring modesty and a sweet simplicity which might have characterized some young novice brought up in the cloister's shade, who had never studied in any other school but that of Christ, or knew of any other praise but the praise of doing well in the sight of God.

It will be said, perhaps, that we have the key to the mystery in the Abbé Perreyve's observation. Whatever may have been, or may now be, the ordinary standard of female education in Italy, learned and accomplished ladies (he says) have been common at all times in that country, and are still no rarity. Women of genius there meet with an impartial and generous encouragement; they are neither absurdly applauded, nor jealously and suspiciously watched; and when they enter upon the studies usually reserved to men, it is neither matter for admiration nor the occasion of a sneer. The outward hyperbolic compliment does not ill veil the inward ill-natured censure; things are on their natural footing. Hence, talented and learned women are not beset with temptations to non-naturalness, affectation, or vanity. We think this reply hardly satisfactory. For, after all, eminence *is* eminence everywhere; and mental acquirements will, *cæteris paribus*, always be more highly commended proportionably in a woman than in a man, because they have been attained with fewer advantages.

Again, it may be said, Rosa Ferrucci was a good Catholic; her religious education had been strictly attended to; her piety was the guardian of her modesty and humility. This is perfectly true; it is the true answer inclusively; but it is not sufficiently explicit. Every one knows that religious principles and devout habits must tend to foster humility and counteract vanity. It is even obvious that good sense, coupled with a sound moral and careful religious education, such as it would be most unfair to deny is imparted, according to their lights, in many Protestant families, has a considerable effect in checking conceit and an overweening self-value; whatever may be its success in eradicating occult pride. If much,

however, can be secured in the way of safeguard against the snares of literary eminence external to the Church, how much more may we not expect within her pale, and under all her sanctifying influences. But this is not precisely the question—which is, not how temptation is overcome, but how it is counteracted and comparatively removed. How are the peculiar temptations incident to female mental and literary superiority deprived of their force by Catholic training?

We believe the answer is to be sought in the prominence given in a genuine Catholic education to its proper objects. The duties of our state in life being our main duties, whatever fits us for their performance is our most valuable and best knowledge. Accordingly, where there is a due conception and estimation of that which constitutes the proper sphere of a Christian woman, there will be a corresponding appreciation of all which trains her to fulfil its requirements; and the child will be brought up with an habitual respect and esteem for that upon which its parents evidently set the greatest practical value. Now, the glory and dignity of woman is to be sought in the performance of her domestic duties. In the family she is the presiding genius, the informing spirit. If the master of the house possesses the executive and repressive power, to the woman belongs the administrative; while the education of at least half the human race, and the first moulding of the minds of the other half, at an age when impressions are most durable, is entirely in her hands. The influence of the mistress of a family is further increased by her relation to the servants forming the household over which she presides. Humble, therefore, as her sphere may be considered, it is, in many respects, as influential, in some more so, than that of man. But this is not our present concern. The true dignity of an occupation consists in this—that it is the fulfilment of our appointed calling.

We are not of the number of those who form an exaggerated estimate of the virtues of our forefathers: each age has its merits, and each has its faults. The middle ages have been, perhaps, almost as absurdly exalted as they were once unfairly depreciated. The fact is, that they have their good and their bad side; and a comparison with the present times must vary in its results, according as we regard the one or the other. We believe, however, that it would be quite true to say that the types of excellence which were before men's minds in those days were eminently Catholic. How grand is their ideal of the Christian hero! How pure, how sweetly austere, that of the Christian matron! How frequently does the description of excellent women in those times remind us of that of the "valiant

woman" in the Proverbs! The care of the household was then considered, not merely as the duty of a woman, but as her honourable duty, and its due fulfilment her glory.

As far as any system of education is truly Catholic, the same solid results will of course ensue in our day; and we believe that many a family in old Catholic countries is reared upon this genuine Christian type to an extent of which we English are scarcely aware. Protestantism surrounds us; and with Protestantism a fresh standard of excellence has been forming,* which, while it admits certain moral and Christian elements, borrows largely from the world. The new ideas on the subject of education and of progress, which are so widely prevalent, have thrown the supernatural end of man far into the background: it is no longer even theoretically the one object to which all educational efforts are directed. With what force all this must react upon our social state, and upon our estimate of the perfection of the female character, must be self-evident; and its influence cannot but tell with injurious effect even upon the manners and habits of Catholic families.

We shall be told, however, that the home virtues of woman are still as highly valued as ever, and that no woman is really esteemed who does not acquit herself well of her domestic duties. This is true in a sense, but with a distinction that amounts to an essential difference. Granted that the woman who neglects the duties of her state is censured; and that ill brought-up children and an ill-ordered household are considered a matter of reproach to the mother and the mistress of a family; yet the fulfilment *in person* of these duties is no longer regarded as necessary; and the manner of their fulfilment is consequently very different from that which the Catholic standard requires. Money and position are at once considered to exonerate a woman from all such troubles; if she can pay for having these duties performed, she is reckoned to have performed them. An accomplished governess for her children, and a respectable and efficient housekeeper over her servants, are regarded as satisfactory substitutes; and no one dreams of accusing her of neglecting her home duties. Having thus freed herself from these vulgar

* How long the traditional habits of the family, founded on the old Catholic type, lingered on in England, is known to those who are but slightly conversant with the annals and memorials of private life that have come down to us. We may, however, take this opportunity of calling attention to that most pleasing work, "The Home Life of English Ladies in the Seventeenth Century." (London: Bell & Daldy, 1860.) The subject is one of the deepest practical interest; and we intend to return to it on an early occasion.

cares, she is in a condition to fill to admiration the sphere for which her education has chiefly prepared her. She presides in the drawing-room; she embellishes home with her cheerful and graceful presence; she takes her place at the head of her table, and in society, to her own and her husband's satisfaction. She pays the tradesmen's bills once a week, or once a month, as the case may be; she makes such changes in her establishment, from time to time, as her housekeeper suggests; but the whole administration and influence are really in that servant's hand, and not in her own; and the same may be said as respects her children and their paid teachers. It is true that there are women who are personally more active, both in the education of their children and in the management of their household affairs; and there are a still larger number who, from the mere fact that they cannot afford either governess or housekeeper, are compelled to perform these offices for themselves, and who acquit themselves therein with more or less of cheerfulness and conscientiousness. But in the regret so often expressed at the little time which such employments leave for other avocations, a lurking feeling is betrayed that a personal discharge of a woman's domestic duties is something by the way—an inconvenience which is necessarily attached to straitened circumstances. Add to which, that few women have been trained to any experimental knowledge of household work: accordingly, when the necessities of their condition compel them to exercise some personal superintendence, their interference, prompted by economy and not guided by knowledge, assumes too often the appearance of a vexatious and intrusive intermeddling in the eyes of their servants; intercourse with whom, if conducted on true Christian principles, by one who was herself an adept in household matters, would exercise the most salutary influence. The dignity of the *materfamilias* is thus altogether lowered and the whole conception vulgarized. It is evident, therefore, that, when people speak of woman fulfilling her home duties, and possessing those feminine virtues which entitle her to commendation, it is not the Catholic type of excellence on which their estimation is founded. Consequently, it is not surprising that personally to excel in the performance of strictly domestic duties is no longer the ambition of women. They are necessary obligations, to neglect which would be disgraceful, but to perform well is not ennobling. Praise and admiration, which follow excellence as its shadow, have moved to another sphere.

Far otherwise is it in families such as that to which this young Italian girl belonged. How different must have been "the grave habits of that Christian household," where (as her

biographer tells us) every veil, every precaution, which the fears of modesty could suggest, was adopted to shield her from the admiration she excited in all who knew her! We can well conceive how a child in the bosom of such a family would learn to attach far more importance to the performance of her domestic duties than to learning and accomplishments.

The conclusion, then, to which we are led is, that the combination in Rosa Ferrucci of the sweetest humility and simplicity with great superiority in learning and talents, while it constitutes one of her great claims on our admiration, points also to an education widely different from that which, unhappily, is so common amongst ourselves. It points to the superior estimate in which all those employments are held which require for their discharge not learning, not talents, not accomplishments, but the possession of every humble Christian virtue. Rich in these, a woman is admirable in all that constitutes the dignity of her sex; if she be learned and talented besides, it is something supplementary and accidental, which may confer a grace, but could never stand in the place of, or excuse inferiority in, any womanly excellence, and which invests it with no real additional merit. Whatever is calculated to attract attention, to charm, to dazzle, to command the praise of the world, will, it is true, ever be a snare to humility and simplicity; it cannot be otherwise. But every one must clearly see with how many more obstacles Divine grace will have to contend, when the standard of excellence in the Christian family has been lowered and warped in condescension to that of the world—when the proficiency which is most warmly commended, from a girl's very first entrance into the schoolroom, is in those things which fit her for quite a different theatre from the scene of the triumphs of the Christian matron.

If Rosa Ferrucci possessed, as apparently she did, every advantage from her education in a family that kept the pure Christian pattern ever before it, the good seed fell on a very rich soil. We judge from the exuberance of the produce. This gracious child early exhibited the peculiar signs which have marked the beginning of those saints who have been saints from their infancy. With the religious discharge of her domestic duties she combined, not only, as we might expect, a tender charity for the poor of Christ, but what her biographer characterizes as a very passion for them. It seemed to have its source in a fountain so full, that it welled forth and overflowed towards every object that called for pity. Her whole soul seemed steeped in compassion. "From the little birds which, when scarcely more than an infant, she loved to

feed in winter-time, to the poor beggars of Pisa, whom she relieved by denying herself in dress and amusements, and the untended graves which she adorned with flowers, 'because,' she would say, 'I feel a pity for neglected graves'—all poverty had resistless claims upon her heart." Her mother relates several touching incidents of her charity. During a severe winter it was observed that she had left off eating bread at her meals, although she took care always to pick out the largest piece for herself. Her parents affected not to know what her object was. She answered, blushing, "I hope I have not done wrong; indeed I did not know it was wrong; but bread is so dear this year, and this piece would serve for one poor person." If she met, when out walking, a poor woman tottering under a heavy load of wood, her first impulse would be to run and help her; and it was difficult to restrain her loving eagerness. She would then gently complain, and declare she could never get accustomed to seeing poor people toiling so hard. One day she went to Florence to purchase some pieces of music. As she entered the town she met a poor family in a state of extreme distress. If their rent were not paid next day, they would be homeless. At once the money was given, and a farewell said to the much-desired pieces of music. When she returned home, and her friends, to hide their admiration, affected to chide her, she replied, "What would you have had me do? How could I have done other than I did? Now tell me, you know well it was *impossible*." "Oh, holy impossibilities!" exclaims her biographer, "which embarrass only those who can never be resigned to the sufferings of others."

For two years before her death Rosa was betrothed to a Signor Gaetano Orsini, a distinguished lawyer of Leghorn. We are not told the reasons for which their marriage was delayed so long, but probably it was on account of the extreme youth of the bride. A constant correspondence was kept up between them; and we believe that our readers will agree with us in thinking that the love-letters of Rosa Ferrucci were well worthy of being given to the world. Written with all simplicity by one who never dreamed that other eyes than those of her lover would peruse them, and expressing as they do the deep, pure love of the writer, they are at the same time a memorial of a most refined and cultivated intellect, and of a fervently religious heart. On this latter point her biographer says: "In the midst of her joys, her hopes, the festive preparations for her wedding and the dreams of future happiness, this young girl had her eye always fixed upon God. One idea, immense, insatiable, the idea of perfection, was the dominant

desire of her soul. She gazed through the veil of her joyous dawns on the Divine Sun of Eternal Beauty. Her happiness made earth look bright to her, but the very brightness of earth immediately made her mindful of heaven. She would begin to sing of her earthly love, but the song soon became a hymn, and always ended with God. It is this insensible and almost involuntary transition, of which the writer seems herself unconscious, from an earthly affection to ardent aspiration after Divine love and perfection, which constitutes the beauty of her letters. The reader must never forget that they were written by one who was little more than a child, and that what there was of maturity in her young soul was derived from that sun of Christian faith whose warm beams ripen the intellect while the heart retains the freshness of its childhood. I believe that real and valuable instruction may be found in these pages; and that while the beautiful language in which her thoughts are couched, reveals the life of duty she habitually led, we may discover many lessons of duty for ourselves. There is nothing of mere poetical dreaming here: all is practical—all is reality."

No extracts would convey a true idea of these remarkable letters,—their fragrance would be dissipated, and their beauty spoilt; we will therefore give some of them at length.

ROSA TO GAETANO.

Pisa, April 16th, 1856.

I can never thank God enough for giving me in you, my Gaetano, an example and a guide for my whole life. I cannot refrain from often saying so to my mother; and I say it because it is deep in my heart. Spite of all the faults and imperfections which have so often prevented my remaining faithful to the good resolutions which I constantly make before God, I have such a high idea of the perfection of a Christian wife, and of the duties I shall soon have to fulfil, that I should really be terrified if I did not confide in the goodness of God, Who can do all, and Who will aid me who can do nothing. I often speak to my mother of the awe with which the sacrament we are going to receive inspires me; and I earnestly beg you, my Gaetano, to ask our Lord for the graces that are necessary to make me what I ought to be. I promise you to use every effort for this end; and I will dedicate the prayers of the month of May to this intention, for I have great confidence that the Blessed Virgin will obtain for me what I still lack. I am sure that a great progress towards perfection will be made if we can get sincerely to detest all those little daily faults, which seem trifles to us, but which must be so very displeasing to the Infinite Perfection of God. In all this be sure I will receive your counsels and admonitions as from him who, by the Will of God, stands to me in the place of father and mother.

April 17th.

I am persuaded that the true means of preparing ourselves to receive the sacrament by which we shall be united for time and eternity, is to make every effort to attain that state of Christian perfection to which God calls us ; and sure I am that, if we cannot arrive absolutely at that degree of perfection which we ardently desire, at least we can kindle in our hearts the flames of that divine love, which is itself the fulfilling of the whole law. In this you will be my guide and my example, Gaetano ; we two shall have but one will ; and we shall have but one love also, since we shall love each other in God, in Whom all affections become holy. Our affection did not spring from anything external, nor from passing beauty, that flower of a day. It was a stronger tie that bound our souls together. We love each other because we love God. Our oneness is in Him, because in Him is all the virtue, all the purity of our love ; because in Him also is our sovereign good. Hence, Gaetano, those alternations of joy and sadness, according as we approach, or seem to be receding from, the ideal type of perfection which is the object of our desires. Ah ! how good God is ; and how often I bless Him for having put such desires and such hopes into our hearts. For me, I behold in God not only the Eternal Power who created Heaven and earth, or the Eternal Love who redeemed us, but also that Tender Mercy who in thee has given me, as it were, His crowning blessing.

April 25th.

Forgive me, Gaetano, my everlasting repetitions ; but how can I help it ? For some time past I have been able only to say the same things over and over again. Now to-day puts me in mind of another day, a dear and solemn one in my memory. I recollect with unspeakable pleasure the solitary walk I took with my mother to speak of you. The stillness of the country, the fresh aspect of nature, the distant voices of the peasants, which alone at intervals broke the profound tranquillity, all seemed new to me, and all spoke to my heart. I can never forget the quiet little church where for the first time I ventured to pray God to bless these new thoughts,—thoughts which held me suspended, as it were, between a doubt and a hope, but in the midst of which I felt my heart fixed in its resolve to do the Divine Will in all things. From that day I have implored, and do constantly implore, the graces which we need in order to lead together a truly Christian life. Do you do the same, Gaetano ; and let me assure you that I find it impossible now to pray to God for myself without mingling your name in my supplications.

April 30th.

He only is worthy of a reward who has earned it by his merits. Do you not know that combat—and what is life but a continual combat ?—must precede victory ? No, we will not be like cowardly soldiers, who would fain have the honours of a triumph without having confronted the foe ; and let us strive to lay hold on eternal felicity, which alone can satisfy the longings of our souls, by faithfully performing all our duties, by supporting for the love of God all the trials of life, heavy or light, by devoting ourselves as much as

possible to good works ; then, Gaetano, the desire of Heaven will not be to us a dreamy ideal, or matter of vague speculation, but it will interpenetrate our life to sanctify it ; and may God give you length of days and rich opportunities to serve His cause by strong and enduring virtues.

May 2nd.

I believe that without setting before us a too ideal and, as it were, unattainable type of perfection, we can effect much by strenuously endeavouring to strengthen our will. Let us keep a watch over it, and never allow it to lean towards what is evil, even in the smallest things. Let us always remember those beautiful words of the Imitation : " If each year we corrected one fault, how soon we should become better ! " Yes, strength of will is always necessary, and not less in small trials than in great ones. In this, it seems to me, Christian perfection really consists ; for what can be more pleasing to God than to see our will always conformed to His ?

May 30th.

No affection which is not grounded in the love of God will make us happy. Let us be well assured of this, Gaetano, and dedicate our whole life to Him Who has done all for us. As for me, I believe that just as the external pomp of worship is of no value in the sight of God when separated from inward devotion, so works can do nothing to merit grace unless they are inwardly animated by a pure intention and the simple desire of pleasing God. So we must always pass on from what is without to what is within ; and this is what I mean when I tell you that I often use visible things as a sort of lever to raise me towards the invisible ; discerning in all that meets my eyes here below an image of that Eternal Beauty which unveils itself only to the intelligence and to the heart. Thus nothing remains voiceless to me. How many things the mountains tell me, and the stars, and the sea, and the trees, and the birds ! and none of these should I have known if the mighty voice of nature had not taught them me. Oh ! how admirable is the goodness of God, Who by so many and various ways is ever leading back our souls to the thoughts and the holy affections for which they were created.

I have been reading in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* this beautiful idea of Jean Paul Richter : " When that which is holy in the soul of the mother responds to that which is holy in the soul of the son, their souls meet and understand each other. " This thought has made a great impression on me ; and it seems to me to contain a grand lesson for those mothers who undertake the religious education of their sons. It shows us also the nature of those ties which bind us so closely to our relations and our friends. For, indeed, why do we love each other with such a true and constant love ? Because what is sacred to your soul is sacred also to mine. Why is it that I am so deeply moved when I hear of some noble action ? when I contemplate the greatness of this world's heroes, and, above all, the greatness of the saints and of the martyrs ? Why do I weep when I hear of the sacrifices they made with so much self-devotion and fortitude ? Because what they revered I revere also. How could more be said in so few words ? Yes,

every man ought to be continually feeding the heavenly fire which God has kindled in his heart. Unhappy he who lets it languish and die out. He loses its warmth for himself, and is himself lost to his brethren, for he has snapped asunder the bond of love which would have united him to them for ever. As the flame ascends on high,

“ Per la sua forma eh' è nata a salire,*

so by nature our souls tend to rise towards God, and if they return again towards earth there is no longer for them either hope of peace or hope of happiness.

July 19th, Feast of St. Vincent de Paul.

Need I ask you what ought to be the object of our desires? Neither honours, nor riches, nor any such earthly vanities, which can add nothing to our peace. Or towards what end our will, strengthened by love, ought to turn? Well do you know it, and often have you taught it me. We ought to strive together to realize in our lives something of that perfection which can be attained only so partially on earth. We ought to look rather at the things that are immortal and eternal than at those of this changeful time, living in such manner that a true love of God may inform our very souls and thoughts, developing all our sentiments towards what is good, and directing all our actions to a holy end. What touching examples of virtue are recalled to us by the feast which this day brings! What an indefatigable and all-embracing charity was there in St. Vincent de Paul; what a lively and ardent piety; what boundless compassion for all the errors, all the faults, all the miseries, all the physical and moral sufferings of man; what invincible patience! Who among us will dare to say that he cannot reproduce in himself at least some faint shadow of these lovely virtues? If we cannot, like this illustrious saint, relieve the sufferings of thousands, at least we can be humble and patient, animated by that true spirit of religion which is always forgiving and loving, because it loves Him Who is all Mercy and all Love!

A writer of whom we wish to speak with all due courtesy, has recently favoured the reading public, in the pages of one of our ablest periodicals,† with the results of her observations and inquiries during “four limited periods of residence in different parts of Italy.” Those results are (in the writer’s opinion) extremely unfavourable in regard to the state of female education in that country. Italian women are taught “languages and music;” and “much desire seems to exist to make this instruction as complete as possible. French and English are almost universally learned, and a small share of geography and history.” They read, it is true; but then it

* “By its very nature, which is born to rise.”

Dante: Purgatorio, cant. xviii.

† *Macmillan's Magazine* for September, 1862.

is only such works as those of Dante and Tasso, for whom this lady writer appears to entertain but a slight esteem; and as for novels, they have none but "eternally dull ones," like the "*Promessi Sposi*" of Manzoni. "Of German, Greek, and Latin, nothing is known"—how large a proportion of her own countrywomen are in a state of similar ignorance, the fair author forgets to inform us. There "remains only English literature; and assuredly nothing better could be desired, if they were only free to profit by its resources." But then come in the governess, and the confessor, and the Index Expurgatorius; and if they are allowed a sight of "that charming new book," "*Uncle Tom's Cabin*," it is only after "all its heretical theology" has been carefully expunged, and the quintessence of the story squeezed into "a pretty little abridgment of about fifty or sixty pages of manuscript." And then there is the Bible—which of course is not read in Italy either by rich or by poor. Consequently, in the matter of "intellectual life," and the "poetic feelings," and mental cultivation generally, the women of Italy are much below the level of their English sisters.

But this is far from being the sum of this lady's revelations. "It is actually a precept of the Church (she informs us) that matters of theology and divinity ought never to be talked of between laymen. Thus, then, a man may rightly admire the wonders of creation, may cast his eyes over all this glorious beauty of Italian earth and seas and skies; but when the thought comes to him of the God who made it, he must not turn to wife or friend and speak of that God. He may rightly addict himself to natural science, and pursue the chain as far as he may through its lower links, but never may he trace it upwards and bind it to the eternal throne. . . . Husband and wife, mother and child, sister and sister, may go through life's dark places side by side, but never may they talk by the way of Him who is guiding them."

There is much more of a similar character which we will not inflict upon our readers. The extract we have given will serve as an indication of the vast amount of arrant nonsense which clever, "liberal-minded" people talk when they suffer themselves to become the victims of their prejudices; and that, too, without a suspicion, apparently, that they are bearing false witness against their neighbours with a recklessness which exceeds all the ordinary bounds of—romancing. That Rosa Ferrucci's writings give token of no little "intellectual life" and "poetic feeling," cannot, we think, be matter of dispute; though they may abound with thoughts and aspirations which, as appertaining to a far higher sphere than that of the merely

sentimental and imaginative, may to an unsympathizing critic appear overwrought and high-flown. True it is that they do not deal with "matters of theology and divinity," if by theology and divinity be understood, as is probable, religious controversy; neither, it must be confessed, would the line of Rosa's studies have altogether accorded with that freedom of speculation in which the Protestant mind claims a right to indulge, seeing that one of her rules was "never to read a doubtful book." But how the following letters can be reconciled with the assertion that Italians are prohibited—by a *precept* of the Church, and therefore under pain of mortal sin—when looking on the beauty of nature, to speak of "the God who made it," is more than we are able to divine, and must leave to this lady and her literary sponsors to explain.

July 15th.

Sweet were the impressions, Gaetano, which our long walk yesterday in that beautiful garden left on my mind. Is it not true that the flowers and the trees and the deep blue sky, the pure sweet air, the songs of the birds and the hum of the insects—everything, in fact, spoke to us of God? I feel so deeply, too, that all those lovely things had more of joy in them to me, because thou wast there, and they all seemed to reflect the feelings of thy heart to me; and then, again, my heart had been moved by those beautiful words of my uncle G—— which my mother had read to us. Earth and heaven, flowers and songs, all seemed to me to form the harmony of those beautiful stanzas.

July 22nd.

I do not know the places you speak of, unless they are Romito and Antigiano. I went as far as La Torre on foot, on a beautiful August morning, without much discomfort from the heat, which was tempered by the sea-breeze. After traversing that long steep road, which at every step grew more solitary as it became more and more hemmed in between the hills and the sea, I went to the top of the little fortress, and thence for a long time I gazed on the neighbouring islands, and the vast horizon where sea and sky seemed to unite; and I could even discern some of the lands of the Maremma. Another time, with the Plezza, the Gabrini, and other friends, we went as far as Romito. The sun had already sunk below the horizon. Every moment the last gleams of twilight were growing fainter and fainter, and soon the moon rose behind the hills. Her white rays were mirrored in the sea, on whose bosom lay one solitary fishing boat; and the murmur of the gentle waves, as they came slowly to break and die on the rocky shore, alone broke the silence of the evening. From time to time, we crossed the dry bed of one of those torrents which precipitate themselves from the mountains into the sea, and so now talking, now silent, gazing and admiring, we passed the two little towers, and having reached the boundary of the two communes, we stopped, and retraced our steps as if we had reached the Columns of Hercules. Here is a comparison that would please my good Luisa V——; only fancy her, in her last letter, gravely

comparing me to a navigator steering towards a new world ! Then she checks herself, and says, " No ; love is a world as old as the earth." That may be, my good Luisa ; but to me it is new, all new, Gaetano ; and I believe it will never grow old, like everything that comes directly from God, Who is Endless Duration in Eternal Youth.

September 15th.

It is drawing near, that dear October. If I cannot enjoy your ruralizing, it will be a happiness to think of the pleasure it will give you. You will see your mountains again, and those pine-groves which from a child I have always loved and admired. Amid the flowers, the plants, and the trees, you will think often of Him who has created us, and made us capable of loving the good and the beautiful ; of Him who this year has opened before you the horizon of a new life, wherein I trust you will never find regrets or thorns. Oh ! how easy, as it seems to me, does the beauty of the country make the love of God to us ! How sweet it is to think that the same God who sends the dews and fertilizing rains to the earth, and decks the trees with their foliage, and covers the fields with their flowers and their harvests, is also that Good Father who comforts us in our sorrows, and so sweetly invites our soul to come and take its rest in Him. Let me talk to thee of the Good God, Gaetano : I do so love to think of Him.

September 25th.

I cannot tell you what pleasure it is to me to gaze into the deep deep azure of the beautiful mornings, whose sweet air never intermits,* and of the lovely evenings, when the stars seem to speak, and tell in a sacred language the wisdom of God. The country does good to our souls. In admiring its ever new riches and beauty, we are the more easily led to think that if earth was created for man, man was created for the love of God. I often say to myself, what will heaven be, if there is so much beauty on this poor earth, where we are rather pilgrims than dwellers ?

On the eve of St. John all Florence was illuminated. There was nothing but merry-making and noisy laughter among the people ; every one was gazing eagerly at the illuminations and the fireworks, but no one thought of admiring the most beautiful ornament of the feast—I mean the moon, whose tremulous rays were reflected in the Arno, and deepened the long shadows of the trees.

September 28th.

Next year we will go to the country together. If you only knew how I love your mountains, with their tall pines, their flowers, their streams, and their green summits ! I always remember the moment when I left them. It was a November morning ; the faint rays of a cloud-veiled sun shed a pale

* " Un' aura dulce, senza mutamento."

" A pleasant air
That intermitted never, never veer'd."
Cary's Dante : Purgatory, cant. xxviii.

light on the horizon, the leaves were falling from the trees, the snow of the day before still covered the summits ; all was sad and solitary around. Who could have told me that to this melancholy spot, which I was leaving as a child, I should return with thee a happy bride ?

October 23rd.

I hope you are enjoying your ruralizing (*villeggiatura*), Gaetano. The pleasures of the country are a thousand times sweeter than those of the town. How pleasant it is of an evening to climb the heights, and thence behold the grand expanse of heaven still purpled by the sun's last rays ; and at one's feet the fields, the pine groves, the pale olives, the trees with their autumnal tints, the little scattered cottages of the peasants, with the smoke of their evening fires rising from the roofs, and the village church, which seems by the tolling of its bell to "weep the dying day :—"

"Il giorno pianger che si muore."

I am far from all this now, but I constantly think of it. I see in my mind's eye that lovely day at Cuccigliana, our mountain walk, and the clear horizon, with its luminous depths, which promised me a joyous future. How many things nature can say ; how she can speak to the heart ! How, above all, she can speak to it of God ! Flowers, hills, woods, earth and sky, how much more beautiful they all are when we learn to discern in them the beauty of God ! How many times have I taken again with you, Gaetano, that walk of ours on the Serchio, where our long talks together had no accompaniment save the rustling of the leaves. Oh ! may God bless thee ; may He make thee happy, and all the desires of thy Rosa will be satisfied.

Rosa Ferrucci was an ardent Italian ; she was thoroughly versed in the history of her own country ; and in the days of Charles Albert, ere the house of Piedmont had so utterly lost its faith and dragged its honour in the dust, her father and brother had taken up arms in its behalf. But she was not the less a fervent Catholic ; and we may safely say that she would have shrunk with horror from the outrages to the Holy See and to the bishops, priests, and religious, which have been perpetrated in the name of liberty and national independence. On one occasion she writes thus :—

In considering the history of nations, we discover at every step new and infallible proofs of the wisdom and omnipotence of Him who directs the affairs of the world—of that mysterious justice which is as far above all human understanding as heaven is above the earth. Hope then in the Lord, ye victims of oppression ! Recognize the hand which alone can give you deliverance. And you, usurpers of the rights of the vanquished, triumph not without trembling at the tears you have made to flow. He lives, and will live for ever, who will never remain deaf to the lamentations of His people Israel. If His justice tarry, ought you to cease believing in Him ? Because He waits with patience, ought that to encourage you in your daring ? Do you forget that God is long-suffering, because He is Eternal ?

The letter that follows shows us this young girl at her studies. We see in it the natural expression of her great love for intellectual and literary pursuits ; but we see also that she did not allow study to entrench upon the time which she thought it right to devote to the more humble employment of needlework ; and that no other ambition mingled itself with the cultivation of letters, but that of making herself a fitter intellectual companion for her future husband :—

I do not think we shall lose by the exchange, when, on finishing Milton, we shall read Virgil together. That great man appears to me indeed “the light and the honour of other poets,” as our Dante says. This reading will afford us the great advantage of being able to compare the principal episodes of the *Æneid* with the best passages in other poems. I assure you I do not regret the time I devote to my little studies. If I had to begin them anew, I should only apply myself to them with more attention and diligence. I owe to them some of my best pleasures ; but, above all, I owe to them community of intellectual life with you. I know no more lively pleasure than that of shutting myself up in my little room with my books and my pen ; and during the hours which I ought, and which I am resolved to give to needlework, I love still to think of my reading, and to beguile the time by those profitable reminiscences.

It may be argued, perhaps, that Rosa Ferrucci was one of those richly endowed beings, rarely met with in any country, and who can scarcely be taken as a specimen of a class. But it is evident from her correspondence, that she by no means felt herself isolated ; and if she was singular, as doubtless she was, in her superior talents and acquirements, she was not so either in her intellectual tastes or in the turn of her mind. She had many friends of her own sex capable of appreciating her character and sharing her pleasures. One such we have already met with in Luisa V——. Rosa was not a person to waste her time and affections in frivolous intimacies, and when we find her writing in the following terms to a certain favoured Maria, we may form a pretty clear idea of what Maria must have been :—

Antignano, July, 1853.

In spite of our joy at being here, believe me, my dear Maria, we feel your absence sadly. The recollection of our happiness last year casts a shade of melancholy over our present enjoyment. I speak from my heart, Maria ; I should be so happy if I had you near me. Come back to us then, dear friend. The little wood in which we passed such happy hours, the great shady trees, the smiling country, and the sea—all call you back. Not two days ago I heard a wave bounding towards the shore, and saying to me, “Come, come down, young girl, from the flowery strand, into this calm sea ; the sun invites you, brightening earth and water with his brilliant rays.” But the mermaid’s song was suddenly interrupted, for the poor wave broke upon a rock. All

its sister wavelets seemed to chaunt the same song of invitation ; but all, like the first, soon broke upon the shore ; and I grew pensive at the sight ; for these poor dissolving waves seemed to me a true image of our shattered hopes, which cost us so many tears. But then a clear little voice murmured sweetly in my ear, "Take courage, why are you sad ? Cannot Maria come back ? I am your good friend *Hope*. Listen to me and trust me. I promise thee next year Maria shall be here." So this consoled me a little, for I always believe what my good friend *Hope* says to me. Courage and patience, then, and I am sure of one day having you at Antignano. Dear Maria, forgive this letter, which is as long as it is foolish ; and if you cannot understand it, seek in it only a new proof of my tender affection for you. Let us now leave the world of dreams, and enter that of news

Of two of her friends, who died young, she speaks with a touching sorrow in her letters to her betrothed, one being the pious and accomplished daughter of Manzoni :—

I have just learnt the death of a very dear friend. Young, beautiful, brought up in opulence, the only daughter of a mother who idolized her, she wished to become a Sister of Charity, in order to serve God in His poor. For ten years she was the tenderest of mothers to orphans, and she has died in the flower of her days. Dear, good Sister Maria, how happy I should be to see her again ! I am always thinking of her. Schiller would say, "Cease to weep ; tears do not raise the dead." But the words which the Redeemer addressed to the afflicted come with a far different power to the heart : "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted !" The more I meditate on these words, and the more I look on earth in all its springtide freshness—the pure light and the deep azure of the skies—the more I am impressed, death notwithstanding, with the infinite goodness of God, and the ineffable joy of the life to come. I hear men say that the wicked oppress the good ; I often see good people in misfortune, but will not they also have their day and their reward ? How often of an evening, when I raise my eyes towards the twinkling stars, I think of the happy souls who are there on high, higher than the stars, in the everlasting enjoyment of the beatific vision, of adoration and of love unfading. If men would but keep their souls fixed on such thoughts, what is there on this earth that could then discourage them ?

More sorrow—Matilda* is dead ! Oh, how we loved her ! What an angel she was ! It is we who suffer ; for to her it is pure happiness to have quitted earth. Never did a murmur escape her ; she found all strength and all peace in the love of God. Her soul so easily opened itself to joy. The day before she died they brought her a bouquet of flowers. "What beautiful things our God has made," was all she said. Her friends wished to warn her father of her imminent danger ; but she always opposed it, wishing to spare her poor father the agony of a last farewell.

I have not yet seen the introduction you speak of. My mother has read me those admirable verses of Manzoni's, which are prefixed to it. They

* Matilda Manzoni, daughter of the celebrated author.

recall so many things to my mind that they have powerfully affected me. As my memory reverted to the days that are past, I seemed to hear the sweet voice of my poor Matilda, who, in reciting his poetry, evinced all the tender admiration she felt for her father's genius. We were at Viareggio ; it was a beautiful summer evening ; Matilda said to me, " Rosa, if you could only tell me the first verse of that stanza I am sure I could repeat the rest." For some time I ransacked my poor memory in vain, when all of a sudden came the word *Soffermati*. It was enough. Matilda repeated to me, without a mistake—and with what expression!—the entire piece of poetry. My poor friend ! she is no longer with us, and we shall never meet on earth again. When I left her, I said " *A rivederci* in a few days ;" I ought to have said, " *A rivederci in heaven* ". . . .

It has been often observed that one side of a correspondence really displays both ; and thus though none of the letters of the beloved Gaetano are given to us, we nevertheless obtain considerable insight into his mind and character. He knew that God had given him a great gift, and he cherished it. Gentle and submissive as Rosa was, she—as gentle and submissive women generally do—unconsciously guided the stronger nature. It is evident that Gaetano did not fill his letters with those expressions of admiration and passionate affection with which—*selon les règles*—a man's love-letters are supposed to abound. Rosa was already his friend and adviser. Into the ear of this young girl were poured the griefs and interior trials of a man engaged in the stir and strife of the world, and suffering from its depressing influences. And how exquisitely does she apply the healing balm, and refresh his drooping spirit :—

July 10th.

Let us not be discouraged, Gaetano ; let us always hope. The good God will help us to become better ; for if we lack strength, at least we are not wanting in good desires. They are the free gift of Him who wills our good—of Him who has given us the most living example of humility, and who will assuredly pardon the weakness of our poor nature, if only we will continue to fight against it with that perseverance which alone has the promise of victory. Ah ! believe me, if we loved the Lord truly, we should think only of Him—of Him, so holy and perfect—and should not be for ever thinking of ourselves, weak, miserable creatures ; and we should end by forgetting ourselves, by losing ourselves, to live only in Him, so worthy of our love ; and thus should we come truly to know that we are nothing, and that He is all. Jesus wills that we be gentle with ourselves, and not be cast down when the frailty of our nature makes us fail in our good resolutions. At times when we are too much dejected at the sight of our poor weaknesses, Jesus Christ seems to say to us, as to the disciples going to Emmaus, " Why converse ye together thus, and are sad ? " He who is called the Prince of Peace wishes us to be peaceable and gentle with ourselves, and to have compassion on our own infirmity. When, then, we are seized with sadness at the sight of our

poverty, and the dryness of our souls, let us say simply and humbly, with S. Catherine of Genoa, "Alas ! my Lord, behold the fruits of my garden. And yet I love thee, my Jesus ; and I will strive to do better for the future."

I received your dear letter this morning, Gaetano, and that you may not suppose that I thought it too gloomy, I must tell you that I also have been thinking of death the whole day. Indeed I offered a special prayer to the Lord to be merciful to me when the hour comes for passing from time to eternity, and, as I hope, "from the human to the Divine." We ought to throw ourselves, once for all, with childlike confidence, into the arms of God, if we would keep alive in our hearts the hope of seeing in heaven Him whom we adore on earth. For my part, if instead of thinking of Him alone, I were to turn to think of myself, I hardly know to what depths my reflections might sink me. But hope, which is a Christian virtue, is the firm expectation of future glory. And so I will forget my fears, and believe that, in spite of our imperfections, we may one day taste, in the bosom of God, a happiness of the very shadow of which we cannot so much as catch a glimpse here on earth. We shall then know in what overflowing measure the Lord rewards even the feeblest efforts of His friends. We shall know how everything here below was inevitably passing away with ourselves—that this earthly life was vanishing with more than the lightness of a dream—so that nothing remains to man after death but love, that ethereal part of the soul which God claims all for Himself. Nay, more ; I believe that the love which shall unite and blend together our souls on high, will not be absorbed in the contemplation of the Divine Essence in such wise that the sweetness of still loving each other shall be unfelt and unheeded. On the contrary, I believe that the triumph of love will be to exist and to endure in God, and to unite in the same canticle of praise the souls which He has made to love one another.

August 4th.

May I tell you, Gaetano, what I have been thinking of with regard to our future life ? We ought first, as we have so often said, to keep always before us the Will of God, endeavour to fulfil it in everything, and submit ourselves to it with our inmost heart. We shall have but one heart and one soul—shall we not ?—in serving God ; and I hope, too, that we shall have but one heart in loving our dear parents. How ungrateful we should be if in our happiness we forgot those who have done so much for us—who loved us before we knew what love was ! Let us strive so to regulate the affections of our heart that one shall not be stifled by another, but that all, combining in sweet harmony, may rise towards Him who has created them, and for whom we ought to live. May He alone be the end of all our acts and thoughts ! Then will our troubles never exceed our courage, our duties will never seem too heavy for us, our lives will be holy, our intentions single, and even here we shall know interior peace—that peace which he knows not who has not experienced it. This is the plan of life I have been thinking of, but which I have scarcely ventured to sketch, fearing I might seem to be prescribing rules to you. The grace of God alone can make all this possible to us. Let us ask it through

the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, on the approaching feast of her Assumption ; we need so much her protection and counsels.

“Orando grazia convien che s' impetri,
Grazia da quella, che puote aiutarti.” *

Our readers will doubtless have been struck with the pensive melancholy which pervades this young girl's letters. Some may even be disposed to reckon her gravity of disposition as unnatural at so tender an age ; and, remembering her early death, will be led perhaps to the conclusion that her approaching departure cast its penumbra over her youthful spirit. But this, we believe, would be to mistake her whole character. To us Rosa's soul would seem to have been a very well-spring of joy, and her feelings alive to the freshest and most pleasurable impressions. No doubt her piety and the tenderness and richness of her imagination imparted a peculiar earnestness to her cast of thought, but we are bold to say that seriousness of mind is natural to youth, where nature has not been thwarted or perverted by education. True, youth is joyous and loves sport, but this is nowise inconsistent with intense seriousness and earnestness of mind. Because young people like to be amused, and have a keen relish of enjoyment—because with them impressions quickly succeed one another, the grave and the gay, smiles and tears, following fast on each other and often mingling together—it were an error to charge them, therefore, with a spirit of levity. Youth is thoughtless and heedless—not because it cannot feel deeply, not because it is incapable of earnest and intense musing—but because the age is not one of reflection, and because of the facility and rapidity with which one mood of mind displaces another.

Youth naturally detests levity, banter, and ridicule. Who has not observed the almost pettish indignation of a child when put off with a jest instead of a serious answer ? Childhood is intensely serious, and half-grown-up childhood partakes of the same character. All the recipient portion of our nature is at that age in the most active state of development. It is impressible to an almost morbid degree. The imagination and fancy are so vivid and so rich, that the young would be far the best poets, if reflection and the other intellectual faculties kept pace with the imagination. As it is, we make better poets at a more sober age, when we feel less vividly, but are able to apply more attention and reflection to what we feel, or rather

* “Grace then must first be gain'd ;
Her grace, whose might can help thee.”
Cary's Dante : Paradise, cant. xxxii.

what we *have felt*—for the poet commonly writes more under remembered than present impressions.

Nevertheless we are free to confess there is a great spirit of levity amongst our youth. It betrays itself in the conventional light handling of almost every topic. Conversations and letters are alike seasoned with it; quizzing, banter, ridicule have made clear decks of sentiment. That object of our special aversion, the “off-hand” young lady, is the special production of modern times; and if *she* is natural, assuredly Rosa Ferrucci was a consummate piece of affectation. But is *she* natural? We believe *she* is pre-eminently the reverse. We believe that little that is natural ever escapes her lips or her pen; we would not do her the injustice to believe that the heartless frivolities to which *she* habitually gives utterance truly represent the feelings and aspirations of her young soul. No; these are buried far beneath the surface—driven into their hiding-places at first in self-defence from the ungenial atmosphere which they would have encountered on venturing forth, but soon habitually suppressed and stifled in deference to the stern rule of a despotic conventionality; just so much of serious and earnest feeling being suffered to appear as may serve to interest and please, without incurring the reproach of sentimentalism or romance. No doubt there are degrees in the amount of the evil, but we are convinced that it is so widely extended and so tyrannous in its action that few escape its influence.

If, then, we desire to witness amongst our daughters the characteristics which adorned this sweet flower of foreign growth—if we wish them to exhibit graces similar in kind, if not equal in degree—we must, we are persuaded, return to the old type of education—not, of course, to the old forms: they cannot always be preserved; nor is it desirable that they should. But the type, the Catholic type, can never vary; nor can woman’s sphere of life essentially change. At present we seem to be cultivating the least sweet portions of her nature; we are bringing her up, not for retirement, not for home, but for a certain publicity;—for the world, in short, where it is impossible to cultivate “the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptibility of a quiet and meek spirit, which is rich in the sight of God.” While this is so we can have little cause to complain, or at least to wonder, that women who aspire after perfection are to be sought almost exclusively in religion; and that the plant which flourishes elsewhere under the common influences of sun and shower, is here an exotic, which our cold winds and sunless skies forbid to struggle into bloom.

The two years of happy betrothal had passed away. Rosa was nineteen, and 1857 was to witness the union of these two beings, who indeed seemed to be made for each other. On New Year's-day Rosa writes thus :—

January 1st, 1857.

Let us pray God with all our hearts, to-day, Gaetano, to bless our union, our souls, our actions, our thoughts, our life. May He vouchsafe long to preserve to us those who are dear, to shield us from great misfortunes, and, above all, never to withdraw His grace from us. These are the prayers we will together offer, united in heart, though separated by distance. God will see the sincerity of our desires, and will hear and answer them. The bright, clear sky gladdens all nature, and rejoices our souls also, who in the light of the sun see as it were a reflection of the Incarnate Light. I do not think I am superstitious, Gaetano, for if the new year had begun in the midst of thunder and lightning and dismal rains, I certainly should not have augured ill for our future. But, now, contemplating the pure serenity of the heavens and of the whole horizon, I ask God to give us a life like to this beautiful day, so that nothing shall ever trouble in our souls that peace which has its source in God, its everlasting fount.

And so a cloudless future seemed to be opening from a cloudless past. Since the death of the young friends about whom she had written, sorrow had not touched her; her pensive cast of thought arose from her deep sympathy for others. But it was not to be. In the midst of that summer's cloudless sky her sun went down. A strange presentiment hung about her. On January 21st, three days before the beginning of her illness, she wrote thus :—

Truly we ought always to be ready to die, when and as God wills, and to love Him infinitely above all the things of this world, which pass away with our frail life. Our immortal soul was not made for earth where all is passing away, dissolving and changing; by the very essence of its nature it longs for Heaven. For me, living or dead, in this world or the next, I will be ever thine, my Gaetano, in the love that God knows and blesses.

This letter was the last that Rosa Ferrucci wrote.

We will give the last most touching scene almost in the words of her French biographer.

The heavenly instinct had not deceived her; two days after that on which she wrote the foregoing letter, death had breathed upon her—a mortal taint was in her veins. She was taken with a slight fever, which at first was such as to cause no alarm, save to the ever-anxious heart of a mother. But on the very first day Rosa said to her, "Take my little desk, and keep it as a remembrance of me." Such words were startling, coming from one so clear-sighted. All at once the illness

assumed an alarming character; and the doctors recognised it as *miliare*, a terrible epidemic which at the time was desolating Tuscany, and seemed to pick out the choicest victims. The young invalid had divined her danger, and asked for the last sacraments, which she received with the most humble and tender piety. She now rallied a little. "Grand and beautiful day!" she said; "if I am restored to life, never shall I forget it. What strength there is in the Holy Viaticum! Dear mother, how sweet and consoling is our religion! Oh, believe me, if any one feared death, he could fear it no longer after having received the Blessed Eucharist!" Then she called her betrothed: "Gaetano," she said, "if it be the good pleasure of God to unite us on earth, He will restore me; but if He has other designs regarding us, then, my Gaetano, we must resign ourselves and adore His holy Will; must we not?" The young man could not speak. She went on: "In my English prayer-book you will find a thanksgiving for the Holy Viaticum; take the book and read it to me;" and a voice trembling with sorrow began to read the well-known beautiful words: "Glory and thanksgiving be to Thee, O Lord, who, in Thy sweetness, hast been pleased to visit and refresh my poor soul. Now let Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word. Now Thou art come to me, and I will not let Thee go; now I willingly bid farewell to the world, and with joy I come to Thee, my God." &c.

When the reader's voice had ceased, the sufferer wished to sleep a little; but she soon roused herself, and continued to pray. One of her brothers was expected from Florence. "Settle the room," said she to her mother, "and put back on my table the things that were taken off it when it was made into an altar. I do not wish poor Antonio to perceive, on entering, that I have received the last sacraments; but be sure, dear mother, always look on that little table as a sacred thing, for it has borne the Body of Jesus Christ." All through this day she held her mother's hand, and spoke of nothing but the joy of having received her Lord. Towards evening she remembered that she was to have visited such and such poor people on that day; this thought troubled her, and she was only quieted by the assurance, that before night some one should go and take them their accustomed relief. She now began to hold converse with our Lord, and to speak to Him with an ardour which the intenseness of her sufferings seemed to render only the more fervent. "O Jesus, this bed is like fire to me—but no, I will not complain: Thou wouldst have me to serve Thee in suffering, and in suffering I will serve Thee. Thou knowest I should not grieve to die, were it

not for the great sorrow my loss will cause to those who love me. If Thou seest that I should make a good Christian wife, I would say, 'Lord, heal me.' But what is it I am asking? No! Thy Will be done, not mine."

In the middle of the night, seeing the shadow of her mother still leaning at her bed's head, she exclaimed, "O the heroic love of mothers!" She thought so much of the least thing that was done for her. "My poor father! My poor mother! What care they take of me! They deprive themselves of sleep for my sake. They have no thought but for me. Mother, what say you of my Gaetano? Now, indeed, do I feel how happy I should have been with him; for the more I know him, the more I feel he loves me—as you love me." Then she asked to have prayers said by her bedside, and began herself to repeat in a low tone the prayers for the dying. Her mother interrupted her: "Rosa, my child, why these sorrowful prayers? You will recover, my child; do not be always thinking of death." She replied, "Ah! but if I have not been able to think of anything but death all the day long! If Jesus wishes to take me, must I not get ready?" Her sufferings were great; for a moment nature prevailed, and she gave utterance to a complaint. Her betrothed said to her, "Rosa, think of what our Lord suffered." "Thanks, Gaetano: how that thought consoles me!"

The next day's dawn only brought an accession of the malady. Three skilful physicians saw that all their efforts were powerless against the disease. One of them, who loved Rosa as his own child, shed tears. The poor sufferer became delirious. "Let us go, let us go," she cried; "adieu, dear mother; my home is not here, my home is above! Let us go, let us go, adieu." These words she repeated, sometimes in French, sometimes in Italian. Her compassionate disposition showed itself even in the ravings of delirium. Now it was a poor desolate widow over whom she mourned. Next it was a poor little orphan child whom she took weeping into her arms. Then she seemed to see the ladder of Jacob, and exclaimed, "But I—am I pure enough to go up with these angels? May I step forward? May I take a part in their choirs—I who was making ready for earthly espousals?" She then came to herself, and asked for a chapter of the *Fioretti* of S. Francis on holy perseverance. While they were reading it, she cried out suddenly, as if struck with horror and dismay, "O the evil spirits, the evil spirits!" Her mother threw her arms round her, pressed her to her heart, and said, "Listen to your mother, Rosa, my dear child; why these cries? why these terrors? You need not fear the bad spirits, dear child; and

they are not devils, but the angels of heaven that surround your bed. Have you not always loved God? Have you not always loved the poor? Have you not been a good and obedient child?" But her face grew stern, and she said, "Silence: tempt me not to pride;" and the shadow of a deep and austere humility passed over her face.

Her delirium returned with increased violence: nothing could calm her. When all resources had failed, the poor mother said, "Rosa, my dear, I am quite exhausted; if you could calm yourself a little, I could rest my head on your hands and sleep. Calm yourself, my child, for my sake." And saying this, she affected to drop asleep; from that moment the poor child was silent. Love was stronger than delirium. A long state of stupor followed: her face became as pale as ivory; the veil of death seemed to fall over her brow; the victim was ready. But there is no victim without sacrifice; and there is no sacrifice without pain. Jesus trembled, and wept, and was sorrowful even to death in Gethsemane. The hour of agony was come for this young Christian: she felt the cold iron of the sword; but again Divine love remained victorious. All at once she came to herself, and opened her large terrified eyes; the life which had been fast ebbing away now returned with an impetuous flow, sending the blood rushing to her cheek, and lighting up her countenance with a preternatural brilliancy. She seemed to awake out of a dream, and then for the first time to understand all. "It must be, then," she cried, "it must be; I must die. I must leave my father's house; I must leave my betrothed! No, no, I am to live with him; I am to make him happy!" Tears flowed in torrents down her cheeks, a cry strong as love burst from her heart. "Farewell, Gaetano, farewell; we shall see each other no more." The struggle was terrible in that poor heart. The funeral shroud was to take the place of the gay wedding-dress. The bride seemed to twine her dying fingers in her nuptial wreath, and to clasp it convulsively—but, if it be God's will? Her mother put to her lips a picture of our Lady of Good Counsel which the young girl had near her bed. She kissed it. Instantly she grew calm, joined her hands together, bowed down her head, and remained perfectly silent. What was it that passed at that moment in the inmost sanctuary of that beautiful soul? The eye of God alone, infinitely holy, can read such secrets. All we know is that, after a long silence, the dying girl said, with a firm, clear voice, "*Fiat voluntas tua.*" And from that moment the name of Gaetano was never again upon her lips.

She recited the Litany of our Lady. At the invocation,

"*Janua cœli, ora pro nobis,*" she pressed her mother's hands, and smiled. Did she then see the eternal doors opening? The Prior of San Sisto, her confessor, was by her bedside. She asked for Extreme Unction, and answered distinctly to all the prayers. Then she cried, "This is the Christian's resurrection; thanks be to Thee, O my God. Oh, now I am very happy." A wonderful grace of peace and strength seemed from this moment to have filled her soul. She no longer needed comfort: it was she who consoled and comforted those around her. The poor mother, wild with grief, threw herself on her bosom. "Still do I hope," said she, sobbing. "Yes, my Rosa, I hope still you will recover; but if God does not will it, pray Him, implore Him, to take me also. I will not, I cannot live without you." And Rosa replied, "No, mother, you must not desire death; you have too many duties to perform on earth; remember the mother of the Maccabees." Then, stretching out her hand, and laying it on her sorrowing parent's head, she said, "I bless her who so often has blessed me. O Mary, change the sorrow of this poor mother into the consolation of the poor, the afflicted, and the sick; and do Thou, O my God, grant that unto the end we may adore Thy Divine decrees." She drew a little ring from her finger, and said, "Mother, keep this in remembrance of me." Then, placing in her hands the ring of her betrothal, she said, "Give it to—you know who—it is a noble soul." But she never named him.

The end drew near. Her relations and friends surrounded the bed; and every one was weeping. She said, smiling, "You are all around me; I am very glad—thanks." Then, suddenly, "Who wishes to have my hair?" No one ventured to answer. She cast a long half-reproachful look on the weeping faces round her. A voice cried, "*I do!*" Rosa recognized it, and said "My mother shall have it!"

She made a sign to the Prior to come to her, and said to him in a whisper, "Pray return this evening to my poor mother, and do all you can to console her." And then she seemed to retire to the feet of God, henceforth to speak to Him alone. "I suffer, my Jesus; but all for Thy love! I fear not hell, because I love Thee too much! I am on fire! I am in flames! Jesus, do Thou burn me, do Thou consume me in the flames of Thy love!" These holy ejaculations with difficulty found utterance—her voice was fast failing. Yet once again, and for the last time, she rallied: death had a hard struggle with the strength of her innocent youth. This time the dying girl spoke the very language of the saints; and her farewell to earth was worthy of a S. Catherine of Siena: "Lord,"

she said, "bless all men; bless this city of Pisa; bless her people, her bishops, and her pastors; bless the Catholic Church; bless her Sovereign Pontiff; bless her ministers and her children. Have pity on poor sinners; enlighten heretics; be merciful to those who believe in Thee; be merciful also to those who believe not. Pardon all; be a loving Father to the good, and to the wicked. O Immaculate Virgin, have pity on my soul! O Jesus, give to all Thy peace!—peace I leave to them." She was silent; a veil came over her eyes; they no longer beheld the things of earth, but a better light began to dawn upon them. "Yes, yes," she murmured, "I see now; I begin to see the holy Jerusalem. O the angels! O how many angels! how beautiful! Yes, certainly, willingly, my God! Where am I? Who calls me? Where then? Let us go, let us leave this, O my God! Let us go—on, on! *Andiamo! andiamo! avanti!*" The words died on her lips; she made the sign of the cross, kissed the crucifix, and, while mortal eyes still sought her on earth, she was following the Lamb in the eternal choirs of the Virgins.

Many words would but mar the impressive solemnity of the scene at which we have just been present; but one remark we will venture upon. Rosa Ferrucci is an example of how saints live and how saints die. The annals of sanctity abound in examples of divine love triumphing over earthly affections; but here we have an example of its triumph in the midst of earthly affections. For it is the glory of Christianity to have made the heart of man capable of loving more, and better than ever, all that is loveable on earth, and at the same time capable of always loving it less than God. The death of the just is not a mere act of resignation, it is a sacrifice; and Rosa Ferrucci's earthly love only furnished the matter of that sacrifice. The young bride of Pisa gives up her nuptial crown to embrace her Heavenly Spouse. There are tears—there are the pangs of a last farewell—there is one dear name that lingers on her lips almost to the confines of Eternity. She wished not for death, she did but obey its call; yet even here we meet with the same unvarying signs that mark the departure of God's chosen ones; even here there is a willing sacrifice and a victim of love.

ART. V.—THE WORK AND THE WANTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

An Account of the State of the Roman-Catholic Religion throughout the World. Written for the use of Pope Innocent XI., by Monsignor Cerri, Secretary of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide. Now first translated from an authentick Italian MS. never published. To which is added a Discourse concerning the State of Religion in England; written in French in the time of King Charles I., and now first translated. With a large Dedication to the present Pope, giving Him a very particular account of the State of Religion amongst Protestants; and of several other matters of importance relating to Great Britain. By Sir Richard Steele. London: Printed for J. Roberts, near the Oxford Arms, in Warwick Lane. MDCCXV.

MORE than a generation of men has passed away since the emancipation of the Catholic Church in Great Britain from the persecution of the penal laws; and nearly half a generation since the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy. We have reached, therefore, a time when we may review the condition of the Church in this country. The silent and gradual expansion of a tree may escape the eye from moment to moment, but in a series of years its breadth of shadow and its rising stature reveal the accumulation of its life and power. So with the Church in England. After a series of vicissitudes more rapid, abrupt, and various than Christianity has ever known in any other land, the Catholic Church goes forth once more to evangelize the English people. England has been Pagan and Christian, then Pagan and Christian again, then Catholic in all the docility of childlike obedience, then indocile in all the pretensions of its national pride, though Catholic still; then reformed (so-called), with all the alternations of action and re-action from continental Protestantism to Hierarchical Anglicanism, from Latitudinarianism to Pietism, from an imitative Catholicism to a thorough Rationalism, which is now spreading on all sides under the foundations of English society. Meanwhile the Church has been twice all but extinct, and twice restored in power.

For the purpose of bringing out more clearly these facts of Divine Providence we have prefixed to this article the title of a work which was published in the last century. It presents us with one of those historical pictures which read like a fiction. To the Catholics of this day, and even to our

Protestant antagonists, it will seem hardly credible that the account of the Roman Catholic religion in England, which now would fill a volume, should be despatched in about a dozen octavo pages; and even of these, three-fourths at least are occupied with an account of the schism under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, and of the appointment of first an Archpriest, and then of a Vicar Apostolic for the whole of England. The description of the actual state of religion in England is contained in a few sentences: "I shall only say, in general, that there are many Catholics in the country at this present time; but that their number is not very considerable if compared with that of the heretics, who are divided into Church of England men, Presbyterians, Quakers, Anabaptists, Independents, and several other sects. The exercise of the Catholic religion is wholly prohibited both in public and in private. The Catholics meet together in some few places to perform Divine worship, but they do so with the utmost secrecy, and not without great danger." It seems incredible that such should have been our state only a century ago. What we purpose in this article, then, is to take a slight survey, by way of contrast, of our present condition, and that rather with a practical view, and for the sake of stimulating zeal and activity, than as a matter of mere literary speculation.

The history of England exhibits in a wonderful way the action of the Church upon the world, and their irreconcilable conflict. It was the Church that civilized England, united its races, founded and consecrated its monarchy. The Church has a twofold mission to mankind. Its first and primary, indeed, is to save souls, to lead men to eternal life. Its second, but no less true, is to ripen and to elevate the social and political life of men by its influences of morality and of law. As the Church is not a mere school of opinion for the enlightenment of the intellect, but a true kingdom for the government of the will, so its mission is not only to direct the conscience and the will of individuals as units, but of fathers as the heads of households, and of princes or governors as the rulers of people and of nations. Hence, by the Divine law of its mission to mankind, arises what is called the social and political status of the Church. The Holy See, in creating Christian Europe, contracted social and political relations with the civil society which it had called into existence. The Church in England formed an integral and vital part of the social and political order of the Saxon races,—permeating its whole structure and life: it anointed their princes, legislated in their parliaments, judged in their tribunals; and being thus intimately united with the whole public life and social order

of the people, the Church accomplished more pervadingly and more uniformly its spiritual mission in guiding men to eternal life. The theory of unconsecrated civil powers, occupied only with the temporal welfare of the people, was unknown to our Saxon forefathers, and would have been rejected by them as an impiety and a folly. True, indeed, it is that civil society has no Divine mission to the souls of men, no custody of revealed truths or laws, no supernatural discernment of what is for the eternal welfare of its members, no faculties to apply itself to the care of souls, nor any authority to direct the conscience. Nevertheless, a State has higher duties than that of conferring purely temporal benefits; and the Church, in consecrating the civil order by the grace of Christianity, enables it to promote the welfare of its people by a discernment and by means which are above its own. Such was eminently the state of Saxon England.

The Anglo-Saxon monarchy belongs to a Christian and patriarchal period, and hardly enters into the text of modern history. It is, like the source of the Nile, hidden but prolific, a mighty and productive cause, but withdrawn from sight. From it descend the unwritten laws, traditions, customs, and characteristic spirit of England in all its ages and in its full maturity. The Norman period, if it be more historical, and more within the range of our cognizance and our criticism, is, nevertheless, a time of culmination and of decline. The English monarchy grew strong; the English Church grew weak. The Saxon period expired in S. Edward, King and Confessor, who symbolized the spirit of that most beautiful age; the Norman reached its full development in Henry VIII., the offspring and the representative of its anti-Catholic spirit and traditions. Nevertheless, in the five centuries of the Norman-English rule, the Church created for itself a vast, mature, and powerful organization for the discharge of its civil mission to the people of England. It participated in all the political life and action, the domestic and foreign policy, the legislative and judicial power, of the monarchy. It had a rich inheritance of ecclesiastical endowments, it accumulated a vast multitude of cleemosynary foundations, it formed and directed a noble and abundant system of education in all its branches and for all classes of the people. The grammar-schools of England, the higher, or, as we call them, the public schools, and the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, were an ample and worthy provision for the education of a people less than three millions in number.

Now, of all these the Reformation robbed the Catholic Church at one blow. It was simply exiled from political

power, and put out of the sphere of the social life of England. Its pastors were driven from the councils of state. They were excluded from all share in the legislation and the government of the realm. Its charitable institutions were taken away, and its schools and universities turned against itself. It is not possible to conceive the state of privation and of poverty to which the Church was reduced. In France, the Protestants were a small minority, who withdrew from the institutions and culture of a Catholic nation. All the accumulated resources of spiritual and intellectual cultivation possessed by the Church of France remained with it still, because the French nation continued faithful. In England all was the reverse—the Catholics were the minority. They were spoiled of all that their fathers had created and accumulated. All the culture, maturity, and intellectual development of the English people, with all the instruments and means of its progress and expansion, remained in the hands of the anti-Catholic majority. It would be difficult to overstate the effects of this spoliation. The Emperor Julian showed the true instinct of an apostate in closing the Christian schools; and the Tudor princess manifested the same subtlety in robbing the Catholics of England of the means of intellectual culture. The true way to weaken an antagonist is to despoil him of the means of knowledge and cultivation.

The prudence and the providence of the great Catholic men of those times was signally shown in the foundation of colleges in Paris, Douai, Lisbon, Valladolid, Rome, and elsewhere, which for three centuries have returned into England a perpetual though scanty stream of educated priests. Nor have these colleges even now, in our better days, exhausted their mission. It is of great moment to the Catholic Church that its priests should practise as little as possible of the *idola specūs* of nationalism, and as much as possible of the culture of other Catholic nations; so that, even when hereafter, as we hope, the whole circle of our Catholic education is completed, there will always be an office of high importance for these colleges to discharge—namely, to contribute the culture of Spain, Portugal, Italy, and France to the culture of England in the members of our priesthood.

It would be wearisome and out of place to enter here into the details of the depression under which the Catholics of England have laboured during the last three hundred years, or to trace out the continual diminution of their numbers and the continual decrease of their strength. For a long time great numbers of the aristocracy and of the landed commonalty maintained their fidelity. In some counties of England a large

proportion of the country gentlemen and their families were Catholic. Now they form a proportion almost inappreciably small. To give an idea of the effect of penal laws, we may state what we have heard on good authority, that in Ireland, between the years 1750 and 1775, five thousand country gentlemen, with their families, apostatized from the faith. Many English families continued Catholic down to the last generation. It was the fathers or the grandfathers of many of the men of the present day who, as it is called, conformed to the Established Church. But these times of oppression were to have an end; and the religious reaction caused by the impieties of the first French Revolution came in like a spring-tide upon England and Ireland. We have little doubt that this was among the remote causes of Catholic emancipation, and of the wonderful religious phenomena which have arisen since the year 1830: such as the revival of religious earnestness, the profuse church-building throughout England and Ireland, the vast efforts for educating the people, the Anglo-Catholic movement, as it is called, of which the analysis has to yet be made, and the intellectual history to be appreciated; and, lastly, the wonderful simulacra of Catholic faith, ritual, and devotion, which sprang up simultaneously and in parallel lines within the Established Church of England and the Established Church of Scotland—namely, what are called Puseyism and Irvingism. All these seem to us to be nothing more than the irregular and impetuous motions of earnest minds driven onward before the irresistible stream of ideas and sympathies which agitated the whole of Christian Europe in its recoil from unbelief and its return towards the sources of supernatural faith.

But we cannot pursue these thoughts further, tempting as they are. We must turn back to the position of the Catholic Church at the time of its emancipation. It found itself stripped of everything, incapable of holding property, of executing a legal trust, of purchasing land for its churches and schools. A few of its churches still remain, spectacles of abject and miserable poverty; such, for instance, as the old Catholic church at Brompton, near Chatham—a structure of planking for walls, with sash windows, and galleries covering half the area, steeped in and squalid with the dirt of years. Great was the faith of those who through all this degradation still beheld and adored the Divine Presence.

But the time was come for a new age to set in. In the reign of William IV. statutes were passed enabling Catholics to make legal trusts for religious and charitable purposes, to purchase land for churches and schools, and to provide endow-

ments for Divine worship and education, and for the maintenance of clergy and school-teachers. By an oversight, or by an absurd and oppressive anomaly, while the Catholic worship was legalized, the celebration of the Mass for the departed—which is a part of that worship—was still held to be a superstitious use. Nevertheless, the position was greatly ameliorated, and Catholics began to enter once more into the social and political life of England. We can remember the fear and dislike with which the first Catholic members were received in the House of Commons, and the abuse with which they were daily treated by the newspapers of this country. We can recollect also with what astonishment and aversion Mr. O'Connell was seen ascending the stairs at a *levée* at Buckingham Palace in the robes and chain of Lord Mayor of Dublin. These were portents in the State,—as when seven moons were seen at once, or when oxen spake and statues sweated blood. Nevertheless, Catholics arose and multiplied on every side. It seemed like the exuberant life of nature. Turn up the soil were you will with a spade, and the surface next the sun will spring with new forms of life. All over England Catholics manifested themselves, and churches and schools created new and visible centres of influence where the Catholic worship had never yet been seen.

Another cause which gave prominence to Catholics was the vehement endeavour of the Protestant Dissenters to reduce the status of the Established Church, by abolishing church-rates, and throwing open the Universities. The Established Church weathered the storm, and in many ways became more active and enterprising; but its traditional dignity was marred, and its exclusive superiority has ever since declined. It is now little more than the richest and most numerous among many sects. The country does not regard it as the representative and the expression of its religious convictions or of its religious affections. This again has given to the Catholic Church a new relative position in the social state of England.

Another cause, too remarkable to be passed over, is the change which took place in two of the most important of our colonies—Canada and Australia. In Canada the Catholic Church was always strong, highly respected, and possessed of great social influence. This was much increased by political changes in the colony, and by the diminution of the exclusive privileges of the Established Churches. In Australia, by the wise and equitable government of Sir Richard Bourke, the Catholic Church and the two Establishments were alike admitted, *pro rata*, to participate in the public revenues. This

•

has given to the Catholic Church in Australia a position and a pre-eminence which it does not possess elsewhere. We mention these two instances because they have undoubtedly reacted upon the mother country, and the stream of legislation has for these thirty years steadily set towards placing the Catholic Church in England on the same footing as in the colonies.

But all these were only preludes to an act which needed a higher hand. The Supreme Pontiff, by the Apostolical Letters, "*Universalis Ecclesia*," created in England a third epoch of its spiritual history. We are too near the great event to be fully conscious of its magnitude. They who shall be removed from it by a century will perceive its full proportions and see the outline of its results. Perhaps there has hardly been in the history of the Church a more timely and visibly providential event than the restoration of the Hierarchy at the special moment when it occurred. The whole Established Church had been in agitation on the subject of Baptism. But the excitement on this special doctrine had been merged in a deeper and more primary question respecting the authority of the Anglican Church in matters of doctrine, and the authority of the Crown as the ultimate judge of ecclesiastical appeals. Every other subject gave way to a discussion of the Royal Supremacy. The press groaned with pamphlets and protests, replies and rejoinders, upon the subject of the Supremacy of the Crown. It was boldly vindicated by the Erastian party; it was impatiently borne by the High Establishment school; it was cavilled at by some, and utterly denied by others. It was denounced by many as an usurpation upon the office of the Church, as a bondage to the civil power, as a violation of the apostolical authority of the Episcopate. Except a few thorough-going Erastians, nobody defended it. Almost everybody lamented it as an excessive claim of the Tudors, and a perpetual danger to the Church of England. Eighteen hundred Anglican clergymen joined in a public protest against it. Just at this moment, in the midst of this agitation, controversy, and awakening of reason and conscience to the true character of the Royal Supremacy, the shadow of a Divine hand fell upon men, and another supremacy was seen to assert itself in England. The English people beheld a Hierarchy of thirteen sees, under a metropolitan, a prince of the Church, rise like an exhalation from the ground, or descend as if from heaven. The calm power, majesty, and might of the Divine Supremacy of the Vicar of Jesus Christ revealed more than ever by contrast the impotence and the unlawfulness of any

human supremacy over the spiritual mission of the Church. It seemed that the very moment had been chosen which should exhibit in the strongest light this contrast of the true and the false. Then began one of the greatest religious tumults of our days. The Parliament, the municipal cities, the Universities, the counties, the Anglican bishops, the clergy of the Establishment, and we know not who besides, were all in a frenzy of excitement, protesting with one voice against Pius IX. for doing what S. Gregory I. had done before. The storm blew furiously. The Protestants threatened a re-enactment of penal laws. Some Catholics blamed everybody who had a hand in the measure, not sparing the Holy See. Croakers croaked. The wise and the prudent were oracular. The timid were frightened; some good men even were carried away by the alarm. It was said that Catholicism was put back in England by a century; that conversions were stopped; that the peaceful relations between Catholics and Protestants were broken; old antipathies revived; and all the gains since the Emancipation, and even the Emancipation itself, endangered.

Now we have always been of those who believed none of these things; but who rather believe, and that most firmly and profoundly, the direct reverse of all these things. We have ever believed that the Hierarchy was the greatest boon that the Vicar of our Lord could have bestowed upon England; that without it Catholicism would have languished; that its efforts would have wanted unity and permanence; that its productiveness would have been only partially developed; that the very gains of the Emancipation would have become dangerous to us; that if Vicars Apostolic suffice for a people under penal laws, nothing less than an ordered and perfect Hierarchy will suffice for a Catholic people restored to freedom; that from the moment of its re-establishment date both the full reorganization of the Church by the restoration of its old Catholic elements and that immense development of ecclesiastical order and spiritual fruitfulness which we now behold. All the noise, and heat, and vehemence, we regard as a cheap price for such a gift; nay, even as conducive to its confirmation. It is held by canonists that pontifical acts need only publication to oblige the conscience. The uproar published the Papal decree. The English people became the *cursores* and apparitors of the Sovereign Pontiff. They made the ears of every man to tingle with the clamorous proclamation, that the Supremacy of the Vicar of our Lord had re-asserted itself in England and claimed of all men submission to its direction. The Royal Supremacy paled before the splendour of the head of the Church of all nations upon earth.

Through all the storm of this conflict one name stands out with a clearness which almost isolated him from all others among the pastors and faithful who bore a foremost part in that great contest. A Jesuit in Rome once asked an English Catholic what he thought of the restoration of the Hierarchy in England. He answered by saying that he believed it to be a Divine providence of the most evident kind, adding that it was visibly "*digitus Dei*." The Jesuit answered, with true Italian felicity, "*Coll' anello di Pio Nono*." We may further add, that the hand to which the execution of the Apostolic Letters, under the seal of the Fisherman, was committed, was the hand of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. It is well known that his friends thought his life in peril; that they endeavoured to prevail on him to continue abroad, saying that his landing in England would be dangerous to him; that they advised him not to appear in the streets, and even to leave the country. And it was generally known that he refused to do any of these things; and that the firmness and calmness of his carriage not only supported the courage of other men, but chiefly prevailed to gain the signal victory which was then achieved.

For many years after this event, both in England and abroad, and even in Rome, Catholics were still found to repeat that the restoration of the Hierarchy, and the uproar which it excited, had put back Catholicism for generations; that the tide of conversion had been arrested; that the growth of all the works of the Church had been indefinitely retarded. During those years these used to be the first questions proposed by the Catholics of France on meeting their English brethren. The same representations were urged in high quarters, even in Rome itself, where the subject was made matter of formal inquiry. It is impossible for us to do more in this article than to mark in outline the true refutation of all these assertions.

And, first of all, we are at a loss to conceive how the restoration of the Hierarchy, which gives back to a mutilated part of the Church its full ecclesiastical perfection, can be an obstacle to the progress of the Catholic religion. Nor, again, how the more public and conspicuous action of the Church, by means of a Hierarchy governing with an open exercise of its prerogatives, can hinder the conversion of a people. Nor, again, how the personal influence and action of thirteen Bishops, in the government and organization of their dioceses, can fail to produce a result both on the mass of the people and on individuals, incomparably beyond the effect produced by eight Vicars Apostolic. But, in fact, the very reverse is

true. We may affirm that the great expansion of the Church dates from the restoration of the Hierarchy; that it marked the commencement of a new period, of which it was itself the instrumental cause. We can only give, in the most rapid way, a few statistics; but they will suffice.

Referring to the Catholic Directories, we find the number of churches and priests in England stated as follows:—

						Churches.	Priests.
1830	410	...
1840	457	542
1850	587	788
1862	824	1,215

To take the vicariate of London alone, we have—

						Religious Houses.	
			Churches.	Priests.		Men.	Women.
1850	104	168		2	17

At this time the vicariate was divided into the dioceses of Westminster and Southwark. In Westminster alone we have—

						Religious Houses.	
			Churches.	Priests.		Men.	Women.
1862	80	184		12	28

Thus the increase in Westminster alone is such that, in every particular except churches, it exceeds the return of the whole vicariate before the division. Other dioceses, such as Birmingham, Salford, and Liverpool, would no doubt present the same result; but we have not the statistics at hand.

Such is the expansion and multiplication of the Church since the restoration of the Hierarchy, as certified by statistics. But these afford only a superficial test. If we would take a more adequate measure, we must look to something more than figures. The Hierarchy engrafted the Catholic Church in England upon the Episcopate of the world; and the influx of the universal Church came into it once more with the full tide of life and vigour. The result was dioceses, cathedrals, chapters, missionary parishes. Then councils provincial and diocesan; then the provisions and traditions of the canon law, adjusted by the Holy See to the condition of our country. Then an intimate union of action and counsel with Rome, such as before had not been attainable. Every bishop in the Hierarchy became a channel of the spirit and mind of the Holy See to his diocese, with a fulness and a minuteness not possible in the vast vicariates of other days. Hence has come

an elevation and a deepening of the ecclesiastical and sacerdotal life, and an activity and a diffusion of Catholic devotion never known before.

The inevitable result of this great expansion of the Church is to multiply its wants, and to expose its members to special social dangers; and of these we will say a few words, or, at least, of the chief of them.

We will begin by briefly noting some of the principal needs of the Church in England.

First, and before all, are needed proper diocesan seminaries, according to the decrees of the Council of Trent, for the education of the priesthood. As yet such do not exist. As yet such could hardly be formed. The Vicars Apostolic of other days had done well in forming ecclesiastical colleges, in which clerical and lay students should be educated together. Out of their poverty they could do no more. And the mixture with ecclesiastical students, if less advantageous to them, was very advantageous to the lay students. But the decrees of Trent are express, and remain to be executed. They provide that to every cathedral church, and to all greater churches, such as the metropolitan, primatial, patriarchal, there shall be attached a school of tonsured clerics, of whom there is reasonable hope that they will persevere in the ecclesiastical life. They provide also, that if any diocese, by reason of poverty, be unable to maintain such a seminary, the metropolitan in the provincial council, or with two of his senior suffragans, shall take measures for the establishment of a seminary common to two or more dioceses. The metropolitan has a *conscientia onerata* to see to the execution of this decree. Until lately dioceses have not existed in England, and the decree has had no application. With the Hierarchy it began to oblige; and now we may trust that the time of its execution is come. In some of the larger of our dioceses, means will not be wanting for a lesser and a greater seminary. In the smaller dioceses, perhaps, a lesser seminary only could for a time be formed. But in all a beginning could be made; and the beginning is half the work. It may seem paradoxical to say that a seminary is even more needed in the smaller than in the larger dioceses. But it is true; for a small clergy has greater need of some centre of ecclesiastical spirit, and of the influence of example and theological help, than a large one, which possesses in itself more resources and a more vigorous life. Moreover, a seminary would certainly multiply the number of such a clergy, by inspiring a desire for the priesthood and generating vocations among the youths and even the boys of the diocese. The chief and acknowledged difficulty is the want of professors, but

these may be supplied by a little foresight; and the English College in Rome seems providentially formed to meet this want. One or two picked men from each diocese would return home in four or five years capable of making at least a sufficient beginning.

But it is not our object nor our duty to enter further into this great subject, which, as we know, has long engaged the most serious thoughts of our bishops and of other persons.

A second want is an adequate system of education for the poor and the middle classes. In the Report of the Poor School Committee of 1853, it is stated that the Catholic schools in England and Wales amount to more than 500. In the Report of the Assistant Commissioner to the Privy Council in 1861, it is stated at over 700. The number of Catholic children in England and Wales requiring education is put at 160,000. The number under education, as given by the Assistant Commissioner, is over 80,000. If in London alone there be 200,000 Catholics, there will be one-fifth between the ages of five and fifteen, or 40,000, needing education. Suppose 10,000 to be an excess, and 12,000 to be in school, as the diocesan returns show, there will be 18,000 or 20,000 Catholic children for whom, after all the efforts which have been made out of our poverty, schools have yet to be provided. To find funds sufficient for this purpose a system is needed which will not only gather or ask alms of Catholics, but so address the intellect, heart, and will of the faithful as to move them to deny themselves for the accomplishment of this great and vital work. We have a full belief that such a system of appeal, if made vigorously and maintained perseveringly, would in a generation adequately provide for our Catholic children.

Another great want is that of a higher literary and scientific education for our laymen—analogous, in fact, to that furnished by the Protestant Universities.

And this leads at once to a question of the highest importance, a solution of which must be promptly made, or it will solve itself by drifting beyond all control. It is well known that Catholics have been admitted for a long period of years to reside and study in Cambridge, but not to take degrees. Until 1854 they were absolutely excluded from Oxford. By a recent change, sanctioned by Act of Parliament, Catholics may reside and study in the colleges and halls of Oxford, and proceed to the degree of Bachelor of Arts. In Cambridge the degree of Master of Arts is also open to them. In the course of the nine years since 1854 it is said that twenty Catholics have passed through Oxford; and it is likely

that others will enter. Now two questions arise—first, whether it be expedient that Catholics should avail themselves of the liberty thus granted to them to study at the two Universities;—and, secondly, if so, whether it be expedient that they should reside as individuals within the walls of the existing colleges and halls, or that a Catholic college and hall be founded to receive them.

We will endeavour to state with the fullest force the reasons alleged on either side.

First.—It is urged that inasmuch as, by the repeal of the penal laws, Catholics are already admitted into the social life and political power of the English people, it is consequent and most advantageous that they should re-enter also into the tradition of intellectual culture and development. If they cannot regain the Universities which the Church created, at least they are no longer excluded from partaking of the benefits they confer.

Secondly.—It is undeniable that the exclusive possession of the Universities gives to the Protestant Englishman an advantage over his Catholic fellow-countryman; and that in order to cope or to compete with Protestants in public and private life, Catholics must be armed with their weapons, and share in the cultivation which constitutes their superiority.

Thirdly.—The two Universities, especially Oxford, retain in a high degree their mediæval if not Catholic character; and it is safer for Catholics to study there than in Paris, or Pisa, or other continental cities.

Fourthly.—Inasmuch as Catholics are admitted into the private and public life of England, it is of great importance that they should enter while young into relations with the men whom afterwards they must consort with in all branches of the public service, and in most of the relations of private life. The time of our exile being over, it is well that our rising generation should take their place in English society.

Fifthly.—It is certain that we can in no other way obtain the advantages of so high a culture in literature and science. The long traditional maturity and accumulated knowledge of the two Universities leave Catholics without a hope of competing with Protestants in these fields.

Sixthly.—Inasmuch as Catholics must be mixed up with Protestants in every walk and state of life, and that more and more as the religious animosities of the past are mitigated by the gradual fusion and blending of families and classes, there cannot be any special danger in their beginning early to learn how to carry themselves towards their Protestant fellow-citizens; or rather it would be far safer for them to acquire betimes such

habits of mind as will fit them for their future contact with anti-Catholic opinions and practices in after life.

Seventhly.—The question is after all hardly under control, for already many Catholics have availed themselves of the admission to Oxford and Cambridge, and many more will do so. We must accept the fact, and deal with it as best we may. Now, it is obvious that a Catholic youth, isolated in a Protestant college, without chapel, or director, or religious instruction, or the example of Catholic companions, must be less able to resist the influences of the anti-Catholic atmosphere to which he is exposed all day long from the whole system and action of the college. Place him in a hall or college founded for Catholics only, under the government of a Catholic president and fellows, with Catholic discipline and instruction, and all the helps of the spiritual life—daily mass, confession, communion, fasts and festivals—such a youth would be sustained and raised above himself, and a Catholic public opinion would be created within the walls which would resist the contagion and infection of the surrounding intellectual and moral evils. It seems evident that the establishment of such a hall is rendered necessary by facts beyond our control, be our wishes what they may.

Eighthly.—Such a hall would be an example of Catholic education and discipline which could not fail powerfully to affect the Universities, and to show by contrast that the alleged inferiority of intellectual culture is more than compensated by spiritual advantages, not only greater in degree, but of a higher order.

Lastly.—Such a hall might exercise a powerful influence in counteracting the downward tendency of our modern University education, and the development of a licence of opinion which is not only anti-Catholic but anti-Christian.

Such we believe to be a fair statement, in outline at least, of the arguments of those who are in favour of the proposal to establish Catholic halls in Oxford and Cambridge, and to complete the education of our youth in the two national Universities.

On the other hand, the reasons of those who oppose it are as follows:—

First.—They neither undervalue the importance of intellectual culture, nor overrate the present intellectual standard among the youths or the professors of our Catholic colleges; but they are of opinion that it is the mission and the duty of the Church to provide such intellectual culture within its own unity. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were creations of the Catholic Church, and what it has

created once it may create again. We are well aware that the Church in England cannot now create for itself a system of education which shall possess the traditional maturity and extension of our Universities. But "*nullum tempus ecclesiæ occurrit.*" We may begin in this day as they first began who came to the schools of S. Frideswide. The Church of the first ages used the schools of Athens and Alexandria so long as it had none of its own. But the first moment it could form true Christian and Catholic schools, the Church withdrew its sons from all contact with an anti-Catholic or even an un-Catholic teaching.

Secondly.—They are of opinion that the anti-Catholic atmosphere of Oxford and Cambridge cannot fail to be secretly and deeply injurious to the faith and morals of the Catholic students. It is a known fact, that of the Catholics who have studied at Trinity College, Dublin, few have escaped without more or less of injury, not only to piety but to faith. And yet the Catholic student there has the advantage of living in one of the most energetically Catholic cities in the world, and of possessing in abundance all the means of his own sanctification and perseverance. They have the best evidence for knowing that Catholics have lost their faith in Trinity College. Hundreds, it is said, could be easily counted up—two of them a dean and a bishop in the Irish Establishment. And even those who do not lose their faith are generally but little attached to their religion, and do not regularly frequent the sacraments. A Catholic bishop who studied there has been heard to say that his preservation from perdition amidst so many dangers, was as great a miracle as the preservation of Daniel in the lions' den. The same prelate is always anxious to keep young men from Trinity College. Such is known to be the judgment of the highest ecclesiastical authorities in Ireland.

If such has been the effect of Trinity College upon those who had every help to resist it, what would be the effect of Oxford and Cambridge upon the handful of Catholics who might study there? Hardly is there to be found any atmosphere more powerful to transform and to assimilate those who live in it to its own properties. What takes place in Dublin, with almost every check to counteract it, may be reasonably predicted of Oxford and Cambridge, where everything is intensely anti-Catholic, and the anti-Catholic spirit dominant and, in a manner, irresistible.

Thirdly.—They believe that even the discipline and spirit of a Catholic hall would not suffice against the powerful allurements and subtle fascinations, intellectual and worldly, of our

English Universities. It is not intended that the members of a Catholic hall, at Oxford or at Cambridge, should live as hermits, or as exiles from academic society. The making of friendships, and the entering into relations with Protestants who will be their companions or colleagues in after life, is part of the argument in favour of such a system. They who oppose this view believe that such contact and society, which in our Universities is very free and irresponsible, would be most dangerous to those who as yet are immature in mind and character. They think that there is evidence enough of the injurious effects of English Protestant society upon the Catholics who court it or live much in it. They believe that the fidelity of Catholics showed more brightly a generation ago through the darkness of the penal laws and of social exile, than now when the sun shines upon them. They are not anxious, therefore, to see the rising Catholic youth brought under those influences, which dazzle and unman their elders, at an age when they are least able to discern and to resist them. They believe that a thorough and hardy training in Catholic faith and morality, and in science and literature read in their light, with the practices and instincts of Catholic devotion, is a better preparation for the conflict which awaits them in the world, and the only safeguard against its fascinations. They would rather see them trained and cultivated by a higher literary and scientific discipline, from the age of eighteen to twenty-two, at Oscott or Ushaw, than see Oscott or Ushaw transferred to Oxford and Cambridge. They believe that Oscott and Ushaw transferred to Oxford and Cambridge would become more or less acclimatized, and that they would lose their high Catholic spirit, and power to mould the character of their youths.

Fourthly.—They believe that the whole argument, so elaborately and eloquently developed by Dr. Newman, in his Lectures on University Education, applies with direct force to this subject. They believe that not only would all history and philosophy be anti-Catholic as delivered from the chairs of Anglican professors, but that it would not be worthy of the name of history or philosophy if withdrawn from the light and guidance of Catholic theology. Whatsoever, then, be the lectures delivered within the walls of the Catholic hall, the teaching of the University and the examinations of the University, which in the end determine the course of study, would inevitably penetrate into the college, and prevail over any individual teacher. Count de Maistre said that history since the Reformation has been in conspiracy against the Catholic Church. We may say that philosophy, since

Descartes, has to a wider extent than is suspected joined in the conspiracy. And yet these are essentially the history and philosophy delivered at the English Universities.

Fifthly.—They cannot find any ground for the sanguine hope that a Catholic hall would teach the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge how to live, or leaven the life and spirit of the Universities. When they see what is the action and power of the whole Hierarchy and priesthood, with all its ecclesiastical organization, aided by the examples of the faithful, upon English society at large, they have little reason to believe that a Catholic hall will do the work of an evangelist in Oxford and Cambridge. The Church acts as a solid and compact body upon the loose and dissolving classes of English society; and yet, though in one sense how great, in another how little, is the impression it makes. But the intellectual and spiritual antagonism at the Universities is compact, disciplined, and tenacious to the highest conceivable degree. The shadow of Peter might, indeed, work a miracle upon it. But there is little reason to believe that the shadow of Peter would be cast by a Catholic hall. They are not without fear that the effect might be diametrically the reverse. Much more would be expected of a Catholic hall than, perhaps, any institution could fulfil; and one Catholic scandal would undo the influence of ten Catholic examples of good.

Sixthly.—They are of opinion that the power the Catholic Church exercises over the people of England comes precisely from the fact that it is separate from it, not mingled with it or dependent upon it. They are ready to believe that a Catholic University in England would powerfully affect both Oxford and Cambridge by its more perfect order and discipline; and that men who desire the welfare of their sons would be strongly attracted to a university of which Ushaw and Oscott may be taken as the preludes. They are the living witnesses of what mediæval Oxford and Cambridge were. And we know that even Protestants who are anxious to save their sons from the squandering and vice of our Universities, have of late years contemplated the sending them to a Catholic college.

Seventhly.—They believe that the risk to a number of individuals is not to be weighed against the danger of committing the Church to a false position. Much as we must deplore that any should be exposed to the occasion of losing either faith or piety, still even this must be endured rather than implicate the Church in relations which involve false principles; for the loss of individuals is an evil to be measured, but the admission of a false principle is a fountain of evils of which no measure can be conceived. It would be a sad but safer alternative to

endure the loss of any number of individuals than to place the Church in the condition it occupies in the universities of Germany. Syncretism has borne, and will bear, its bitter fruits there as a warning to us.

Eighthly.—The founding of such a hall would be a public and authoritative sanction, and even invitation, to Catholics to send their sons to Protestant universities. The Church itself would be giving the impulse in that direction.

Ninthly.—Such a course would indefinitely postpone all efforts towards founding purely Catholic colleges for higher lay education; a work absolutely needed already, and becoming every day more urgently and vitally necessary as the Catholic Church expands its own system, and multiplies its members, among the middle and higher classes.

Tenthly.—They submit that the question of founding a hall in the Anglican Universities, so as to participate in a common secular education, reserving the particular religious instruction, is no longer open. It seems rather to involve a concession of the whole principle for which we have been so long and so earnestly contending. This alleged separateness of secular and religious teaching was the basis of Mr. Stanley's Irish education scheme, against which the Catholic Church in Ireland so firmly opposed itself; and from which, under the sanction of the Holy See, it is now extricating itself. This also is the basis of the Godless Colleges, which the Holy See has declared to be "*intrinsecè periculosa*," and to which the Synod of Thurles warns the faithful not to send their sons. It forbids also any priest to teach in them. This also was the motive for founding the Catholic University so expressly approved by Rome, and so cherished by the episcopate and people of Ireland. This, again, is the scheme of secular and general education which, when proposed by the Government, caused the great educational movement of the last five-and-twenty years. Against this it was that the Catholics of England also protested, and from which they so jealously and successfully protected themselves by the agreement embodied in the Minutes of the Privy Council in 1847. It would seem, therefore, to be a departure from the whole of our past conduct, and a giving up of the principles for which we have so strongly contended. How shall we refuse a common secular education for our poor children if we court and catch at it for the children of the rich?

Eleventhly.—It would seem also that this is the worst moment for making such a compromise. If it was permissible for the Catholics in Ireland to submit to the National Education Board, and to avail themselves of the only education possible

to them by reason of their poverty, certainly the rich families of England can find no such excuse for seeking admission to our Protestant Universities. They have abundant means of educating their children; and if the standard of intellectual cultivation in our Catholic colleges be not so high as at Oxford and Cambridge, no amount of intellectual culture or social advantage can be weighed in the scale against the least measure of fidelity to the Catholic faith and Catholic morality. It is to be always remembered that the Irish national education, if it was un-Catholic, was at least not anti-Catholic. If it was deprived of positive Catholic teaching and influence, it was not guided nor impelled by an anti-Catholic spirit. But with our Universities this is not so. They are formally, essentially, traditionally, and, so far as any influence Catholics can exert upon them, immutably anti-Catholic. The English schism and the Protestant heresy have penetrated to the bone, and poisoned the life-blood of Oxford and Cambridge, the great schools of Anglicanism,—which they will never cease to be except by exchanging the partial Rationalism of the Reformation, for that fuller Rationalism which is its legitimate development. And this greatly strengthens their argument, and confirms their opposition to such a scheme of united education for Catholics and Protestants. They would have objected to the sending of our Catholic youths to Oxford and Cambridge at any period, since the Reformation, when the Universities were at their highest point of Christian belief, while as yet the inspiration and integrity of Holy Scripture were held sacred, and Rationalism had as yet found no formal entrance into them. How much more, then, at the time when the modern spirit of cultivated unbelief, in the form of criticism and philosophy, has not only entered but established itself, so as to be the predominant intellectual tendency of the more studious members of the Universities. The Protestant Bishops of Winchester and London have confessed what Dr. Colenso has repeated,—that the graduates of Oxford and Cambridge are turning away from Anglican orders. The *Times* may try to persuade men that this is because the clergy are underpaid. They who are acquainted with the Universities and public opinion, know that the true reason is an intellectual departure from the traditional Christianity of England. And is it at such a moment as this that Catholics will forsake the strongholds which have protected them these three hundred years, to venture into the midst of the occasions of unbelief presented by the Rationalism which gains head day by day? The Catholic Church in Ireland no sooner begins to feel its freedom, and with freedom the return of strength, than it begins at once to liberate itself

from the un-Catholic system of national education. It is no time, therefore, for the Catholics in England to make a step so retrograde, and so utterly at variance with the whole march and extension of the Catholic Church in this country. We have already noticed the wonderful unfolding of the Church—how the Catholics who lay scattered and hid in the millions of the English people have been drawn and knit together by the Hierarchy into a visible body, which every year increases in bulk and vigour and fruitfulness. The Church is reproducing its past with an exuberance of life and a precision of action which leaves us nothing to desire but patience, and fidelity to the immutable principles and the supernatural instincts of the faith. If in the times of their poverty the Vicars Apostolic could found and raise three such colleges as Old Hall, Oscott, and Ushaw, why should not the united Catholic Hierarchy of England found a University? They did it when Catholics were few, scattered, and poor in the extreme. We live in days when Catholics are numerous, united, and conscious of their union, and, if not rich, yet possessed of wealth as compared with the poverty of the past. If the Catholics of the penal laws could do such things, why should not the free Catholics of to-day do greater things, if only they have the zeal, the fidelity, the high Catholic instincts, and the unbending integrity of Catholic principle, which, as we have said, were luxuriant in our darker days. God forbid that these virtues should droop and fade in our days of peace!

Twelfthly.—Nor is it to be thought that the founding of a Catholic University in England is a dream of Utopia. A body which has in one day founded thirteen dioceses and developed them as we have shown above, need shrink from no enterprise. It possesses already all the elements of a University. Its eight lesser colleges of Sedgley Park, Mount S. Mary's, S. Edward's, Downside, Ratcliffe, S. Beuno's, Beaumont Lodge, Ampleforth, and its four greater colleges of Stonyhurst, Oscott, Old Hall, and Ushaw, naturally lead up to and demand a University for their completion, as an arch demands its keystone. Neither is there lack of materials for such a work. The Church of all nations can draw upon the nationality of all nations for its institutions. The Society of Jesus alone contains in itself men capable of holding professors' chairs in all the chief faculties of arts, literature, and science. For classical literature and Oriental languages, Germany is open to us; for theology, Italy; for science, history, modern languages, and literature, all Catholic nations; for if Protestantism possesses the culture of England, the culture of other nations is Catholic. The founding of a Catholic University in Eng-

land is therefore a thing not only to be desired, but to be achieved with no greater difficulty than besets all great enterprises; and all the enterprises of the Catholic Church are great, and none are difficult, because it is the Church which for eighteen hundred years has accomplished greater works in a power above its own.

But here we must leave this subject. We have done no more than enumerate the arguments *per summa capita*, reserving to ourselves, if need be, a fuller and more adequate treatment of it.

Another want is greater practical efficiency and more public usefulness in our laymen. The social exile in which they have lived, and their exclusion, if not by statute, yet by traditional prejudice, from public and even private employments, have seriously diminished their capacities of usefulness. No English Catholic has any chance of being returned by an English constituency. The only Catholic member for an English seat is returned by the legitimate influence of a Catholic family. But in time this evil would correct itself, if in our larger towns Catholics were found with capacities for public business—we will not say up to the measure of the late Frederick Lucas, but the same in kind—we mean manly good sense, with a thorough mastery of their subject. If among the Catholic members there were men who would thoroughly study, each one branch of the public service—finance, poor-law, colonies, trade in its details, and the like—they would certainly command the ear of the House at all times, and where any subject of the Catholic Church were concerned would be listened to with respect. The English people are easily conciliated by any public usefulness, or power of beneficence. We have often heard it said, and we think truly, that our chief *man* of public business, after the late Mr. Lucas, was Mrs. Chisholm. In her charitable schemes for promoting emigration, she received the support and co-operation of the most unlikely persons, of all political and religious parties, who, seeing her great usefulness, made no question of her religion.

The only other want we will notice is that hitherto the Catholic Church of England has no organ or provision whatever for foreign missions. It may be said that England is itself a missionary country, and could hardly be expected to undertake missions to other lands, or to give to others what it hardly possesses itself. But this does not seem to us to be true. England is a special debtor to the world—first to its own colonies, next to the nations and races which are opened to it by its commerce. It would be a shame and a rebuke to us if, while Protestant England acknowledges this duty, and sends its missionaries

abroad at the cost of nearly half a million a-year, Catholic England should do nothing. Such was not the temper of the faithful who lived under the heathen empire of Rome. They regarded the world-wide structure of its power, with all the activity of its material life, as the means and conditions by which they might traverse its vast circuit, and bear the light of salvation to the most distant races of mankind. The time is come for us to recognize this duty—we may say this providential call; and in obeying it we shall obtain great and specific blessings. It is well known that no congregation in France obtains more or better vocations than the *Congrégation des Missions Etrangères*. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church; and the *Salle des Martyrs* inspires vocations in the generous youth of France. So it would be with England. We believe that a College of Foreign Missions, worthily directed, would elevate the ecclesiastical spirit and multiply vocations even for the Church at home. But we can but touch by the way a question which demands a direct and ample treatment.

So much in few words of our chief wants; of those at least which we think it within our province to notice. It may be well, perhaps, to add also a few on our dangers.

One copious and manifold source of danger is the anti-Catholic atmosphere—the Germans would call it the time-spirit,—or the dominant current of thought and action which pervades the age and society in which we are born. No one wholly escapes its influence; most are deeply penetrated with it. We doubt whether it was so dangerous to Catholics before the Emancipation as it is now. In those days the direct action of persecuting laws ground down or bore down the courage of multitudes. But the allurements of English society and English public opinion had little power. They were hostile, harassing, and repulsive. Now they are far more perilous; being bland, insidious, and seducing. Public opinion is Protestant; and Protestantism is formally opposed to the idea of a Church divinely constituted and endowed. The first principles and maxims of Catholic education—such as submission to a teaching authority, fear of error, mistrust of our own judgments—are extinct. This spirit begins in our schools, pervades our Universities, and animates the whole of English society. We cannot draw breath without inhaling it; and the effect of it is visible upon men who do not suspect themselves of any want of Catholic instincts. It has become unconscious; and what strikes and offends foreign Catholics, is hardly, or not at all, perceived by those who are born into this atmosphere.

Another serious danger, which might also have been treated as a want, proceeds from the absence of a Catholic literature. As we have said, the culture of the English people passed into the hands of the men of the Reformation, leaving the Catholic remnant stripped of everything. The first race of Catholics, such as Stapleton and Harding, had received their cultivation before the schism. Many of those who immediately succeeded, such as Parsons and Baker, had been educated in the Universities. With them the English Catholic literature ceased until the reign of James II. At that time a few controversial octavos without name of the author, and printed either abroad or at the private printing-press in Oxford, were published; but a literature—that is, works on history, biography, science physical and moral, or of general information, poetry or fiction—by Catholic hands, has never existed. The Catholics of England have been compelled either to read foreign Catholic works, which are accessible only to a few, or the books of anti-Catholic writers, or, as with the great majority, to be deprived of the wholesome culture and information on which the development of the intelligence depends. We can never forget the passage in Lord Macaulay's "History of England,"* in which he indulges in a misplaced satire upon the English written by Catholics in the time of James II. It was assuredly bad enough. Those days are happily past, and Catholics can speak and write their mother English with no inferiority to their anti-Catholic fellow-countrymen. Nevertheless a Catholic literature is yet to be formed; and its non-existence entails on our youth disadvantages, the extent and perilous character of which it is difficult to estimate.

But a still graver danger seems to us to be one which many least suspect. We are less afraid of any evils *ab extra*, howsoever grave or imminent, than of any evil, howsoever light it may appear, which penetrates the interior spirit of what we may call the Catholic society of England. We have said once and again that the old days of storm were rough, but safer for us. We have much more fear of the sunshine. When Xenophon's soldiers beheld the sea, they fell on their knees and worshipped. When Linnæus first saw the common furze in full bloom, we are told that he knelt down and bared his head. Whether these ecstasies be historical or no, we will not stop to enquire; but they illustrate the fascination of things long hoped for, found at last, and the proneness of man to pay a superstitious adoration, like the Athenians, to the unknown God. We should

* Vol. ii. pp. 110, 111.

be gravely alarmed if there appeared, among other signs of the times, a world-worship among Catholics; and above all if that world were the English world, which has only just begun to tolerate the faith and the persons of Catholics. The polity of England as it exists in statutes is indeed changed, but the policy of Governments lags behind the letter of the law. The anti-Catholic spirit of English society controls the public administration, from the patronage of the Crown to the votes of the parish vestry. So likewise in what is called "society," that is, in the customs and intercourse of the richer families of the higher and middle classes. In the last thirty years, Catholics have penetrated into this sanctuary, as adventurous travellers into S. Sophia. Too often we fear they have put off their shoes upon the threshold; and even, like our adventurous Captain Burton at Mecca, have entered as sound Mahommedans. Now it seems to us that any gratuitous conformity on the part of Catholics to the rubrics of worldliness, and still more any simulation of the tone of an un-Catholic society, even by the concealment of their own faith, much more by their wearing the vestments of another religion, would be not only an infidelity towards God, but what some people may think much worse—a signal imprudence towards the world they desire to propitiate by their worship. English society, with all its vices, does, after all, represent the English character. There is something downright, manly, and decided in it; and it respects the same—that is, its own—qualities in others as much as it despises and ridicules all servile or petty eagerness to court its favour. Downright, manly, and decided Catholics—more Roman than Rome, and more ultramontane than the Pope himself—may enter English society and be treated with goodwill and respect everywhere, if only they hold their own with self-respect and a delicate consideration of what is due to others. It is this very boldness which inspires both respect and confidence. It is the pledge of sincerity, and sincerity is respected by everybody worthy of the name of Englishman. No greater blunder could be committed than to try to propitiate Englishmen or English society by a tame, diluted, timid, or worldly Catholicism.

But it is not our purpose to write a homily, and our pages warn us to draw to an end. A few words, and no more, we may add on the remedies we need. Philosophers divide forces into mechanical and dynamical; and we would say that what we need is not so much in the mechanical order as in that of the interior forces of will and character, both natural and supernatural. We have great works to do, and at first sight little material out of which to create them. But it is His work

who chooses "things that are not, that He may bring to nought the things that are." And it is the paradox and the glory of the Church, as verified in its history, to do the greatest works with the slenderest means. At every turn we are met by the same objection. At the commencement of every great work we are asked, But where are the men, and where is the money? It is not in impatience, but in pure conviction, we would answer: Vigour creates men and coins money. If we had only vigour, as our Lord said of faith, all things in His service would be easy to us. We are in an age of enterprise, and are busied with all manner of schemes for works of piety and charity. Even our amusements have taken a pious turn. We have concerts, theatricals, balls, excursions, and the like, for religious ends. The world itself, it seems, is becoming pious. "All things to me are lawful." But this is only on the surface. We have a deeper service of the Spirit to learn and to practise; a mightier power is needed wherewith to achieve the important works we have to do. Amphion built cities, but concerts will not remove mountains; and the Church in England has mountains in its path. We do not wish to disquiet the conscience of anyone taking a harmless interest in innocent things; but there is a harder service yet to be done, and when begun, these softer things will go over the horizon as the thistle-down is blown away from a field of battle. There is a sharper note in the trumpet which gives no uncertain sound; and it is calling us to higher paths than to Willis's Rooms. Catholics have taught the world to build and endow churches, colleges, monasteries—out of their own sole inheritance, for the love of Jesus and of the souls for whom He died. Catholics have taught the world to sell all and follow Christ: that His words are to be taken to the letter now as in the beginning; in England as in Palestine. Catholics have taught the world the law of almsgiving—that it ought to be proportionate, and not out of superfluity, or of that which costs us nothing. And we are bound to bear our witness that the world has in some degree profited by the lesson. Noble examples in the last twenty years have been and are among our brethren of the separation. And we pray God to bless their generosity with the reward of a perfect faith. But they who have done these noble deeds have not done them by the above-named means. They have not learned these means of us. We rather have learned them of the world, against which it behoved us always to bear witness to the highest wisdom and the highest good, which not only condemns evil, but gently discountenances the innocent but less expedient ways of serving our Master. Let every one enjoy his Christian liberty. But do not let us

mistake the soft and the easy ways of charity for the spirit of the Church. In us it would be a degeneracy which would justly bring down upon us the rebuke deserved by the modern Greeks:—

Ye have the Pyrrhic dance as yet :
Where is the Pyrrhic phalanx gone ?
Of two such lessons why forget
The nobler and the manlier one ?

And here we would leave the matter. We have an unlimited confidence in the charity which first measures the work to be done in the light of the Blessed Sacrament, and then its own means of doing it with crucifix in hand; and in the doing conceal itself so that the left hand knows not what the right hand doeth. On this we rely, and to this we appeal, leaving all other forms of modern charity to drop off as the toys and gauds of infancy. "When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away the things of a child."*

And now, to sum up all we have said of our dangers, we would repeat that what we most fear is that Catholics may cast themselves willingly, or be drawn unconsciously, into the stream which is evidently carrying English society every year more and more decidedly and perceptibly towards worldliness and Rationalism. The growth of worldliness in every form, the appearance of moral evils in our domestic life, the breaking down of the barriers which guarded the last generation; the lower, laxer, freer habits, not only of men but of women, not only of mature age but of the young, both before and after marriage; the growth and multiplication of forms of social corruption never known before, or, at least, never so systematically practised and so habitually connived at; the abdication of authority by parents, and the derision of authority by children;—all these and many more signs are abroad to warn us that a dangerous future is before us, and to awaken Catholics to a redoubled vigilance over themselves and their children, and a greater fidelity to the Church which, with a gentle austerity, restrains them from many points of contact with the anti-Catholic society of England. If any one desire a signal example of our meaning, let him read an article in the *Saturday Review* of July 4, misnamed, we think, by an unseasonable jocularity, "Frisky Matrons." We see nothing to laugh at in an evil which, like the head-disease called the *plica polonica*,

* 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

seems light and superficial, but really eats into the blood and bone. This is not the atmosphere to which we desire our Catholic women to be acclimatized, or in which we wish their daughters to be reared. The readers of the *Times* will not need us to remind them of the articles on "Pretty Horse-breakers," and on the growing infrequency of marriage among the young men of the higher classes of society. But we will not pursue these subjects further. This is not the atmosphere in which the Catholics of the penal laws would have desired to immerse their sons and daughters; and we trust that the Catholics of this day will be faithful to the high moral discernment and traditions of their fathers.

As to the other danger which lies before us, from the development of Rationalism, it is impossible to do more than make a passing allusion to it. We are firmly convinced that in twenty years Rationalism will inundate England. In every century since the Reformation England has sunk lower and lower in formal rejection of revealed doctrine. It has passed through the two phases which have appeared in Germany, and it is entering upon the third. The period of Protestant dogmatism has given place to Protestant pietism, and this is now passing off into Protestant Rationalism,—the prelude of Philosophical Rationalism in the educated, and rude unbelief in the people. The school of Hooker, Andrews, and Laud numbers now but a handful of the population. It is an esoteric literature, not a living power. The school of Cecil, Venn, and Simeon has issued in a multitude of dissolving forms of opinion. The school of rationalistic Christianity is numerous and growing, and possesses many high places of trust and influence. Dr. Colenso is a fair sample of the actual and dominant tendency of religious belief among us. There can be little question that, if the majority of the Anglican clergy be against him, the vast majority of the Anglican laity would be with him. His common-sense scepticism is the true Anglican layman's faith. And we cannot doubt that every year this unbelief will more widely spread, and that the two Universities will be thoroughly pervaded by it. Instead, therefore, of implicating ourselves in a sinking wreck, it is the prudence of common sense, as well as the obligation of Catholic duty, to keep ourselves free, not only from all entanglements with it, but as far as possible from the vortex which it makes in going down. We earnestly hope that Catholics, while they manifest to their fellow-countrymen the largest social charity and the truest public fidelity, will keep themselves from all contact with the traditions of anti-Catholic policy and education. We repeat again, that an education deprived of the light of faith and the guidance

of the Church, is essentially anti-Catholic. Here there can be no neutrality: "He that is not for Me is against Me." There is but one safety for us: "Sentire cum Ecclesiâ," in the whole extent of faith, discipline, worship, customs, and instincts—the most intimate and filial fidelity of intellect, heart, and will to the living voice of the Church of God.

Essays and Miscellaneous Papers.

THIS department is intended to include papers on various subjects of interest which admit of more or less latitude of opinion among Catholics, and in the treatment of which it appears desirable that fuller scope should be given to individuality whether of thought or expression than is consistent with the corporate character of a Review.

In regard to all such papers we are simply responsible for the judgment that they contain nothing which a good Catholic is not at liberty to hold; and that their publication is expedient and beneficial.

Occasional papers on subjects which may be more gracefully and graphically treated where the writer is able to speak more directly in his own proper person, will also find their appropriate place in this department of our REVIEW.

A specimen of such a subject, so treated, we are enabled to present to our readers in the following paper, the first of a series of four, read by Canon Oakeley before the English Academy of the Catholic Religion, at the end of the last and the beginning of the present year. The remaining three will appear successively in our future numbers.

We may possibly be biassed in our judgment by personal associations, but we certainly think that the Tractarian movement, to which these papers refer, possessed a very special character of its own, and is well worthy the study of any thoughtful Catholic. Among other peculiarities, it has this remarkable one,—it was assuredly a movement tending from heresy towards Catholicism: the event in so many individual instances indicates this; and we think that no intelligent Catholic acquainted with the phenomena will doubt it. And yet the *human* influences under which it advanced were not on the whole Catholic influences acting from without, but internal influences pressing the agents blindly forward.

On the other hand, the movement in question was radically and fundamentally dissimilar to any which had previously existed in the Establishment since the schism of the 16th century. Whatever may have been its superficial resemblance, or its historical relation, to the *Landian* and *Non-juring* reactions respectively, it really stood over against them in the

broadest contrast; differing from them simply as a reality differs from a sham. In may be asked how we are to account for this indubitable contrast:—why it is that Tractarianism was so fertile in those practical results, which were conspicuously absent in the earlier movements. And our belief is, that there is one cause for this so predominant that no other is worthy of mention: we mean the personal gifts and personal influence of Mr. Newman. We designate him by his pre-Catholic name, as we are speaking of his pre-Catholic career; and we believe that in proportion as any Catholic is cognizant of the circumstances, he will acquit us of exaggeration in what we have just said. A protest, indeed, may imaginably be made in Mr. Froude's behalf, of whom Canon Oakeley gives so touching and life-like a picture in the following paper, and who, it is generally believed, was mainly instrumental in converting Mr. Newman to Tractarian ideas. That Mr. Froude's character exhibits traits of most unusual humility, self-government, unworldliness, and energy, it would, we think, be impossible to deny. Nor can it be doubted that these noble qualities enabled him to see through many fallacies which imposed on others, and to recognize many great truths of which his contemporaries little dreamed. Still many might fail to see in his writings those rare intellectual excellences ascribed to him by his friends; while there appear to be strong reasons for believing that, had the movement been under his guidance, it would have been barren of all important practical issue.

Such questions as these, however, appertain to what may be called a philosophical history of Tractarianism; and it will be long before the period has arrived for successfully attempting such a history. Canon Oakeley rather aims at a graphic and pictorial exhibition of the *facts*, than at a careful analysis of the various principles and influences which were at work; and his papers also have a peculiar value from containing his personal reminiscences of events, "*quorum*," it may truly be said, "*pars magna fuit*." His undertaking appears to us peculiarly well-timed; for it is necessary that we should first obtain the widest possible knowledge of facts, if we would philosophize to any purpose. Those of our readers who may have themselves once been Tractarians, will be interested in the revival of many remembrances almost extinct; and some, we hope, of those who have had no personal connection with the movement, may not be displeased at obtaining further knowledge of its details. The freshness and vividness of description; the geniality and kindliness of tone; the many personal references and allusions;—all combine in giving a

peculiar charm to the following narrative. And to one particular we would specially advert; viz., the author's treatment of theological opponents. Without the least compromise of his own loyalty to the one sovereign and exclusive Truth, he is full of consideration and tenderness towards those who, unhappily for themselves, have failed to attain it.

It may be worth while to make one final remark on a matter to which Canon Oakeley has not referred. Some fifteen years ago there was (not unnaturally) considerable fear with many, lest those who had entered the Church by the Tractarian road should form a kind of clique or party, acting in concert together, and standing aloof from other Catholics. Of course it cannot be denied that there is a certain family likeness among those nurtured in Tractarianism, from the great similarity of influences to which they have been subjected. But it is somewhat remarkable that, among all the various divisions of action and opinion which exist among English Catholics, there is none which can be characterized as a convert party; while there is perhaps not one which does not number among its adherents various *çi-devant* Tractarians.

HISTORICAL NOTES OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.*

PART I.—*From the Beginning of the Movement to the Publication of Tract 90 (exclusive).*

WITH the view of helping to keep alive the memory of an important crisis in the ecclesiastical annals of this country, the contemporary witnesses to which will soon have passed away, I purpose, not to write a history, but to set down certain notes or memoranda of the great religious movement which took its rise in the University of Oxford about thirty years ago. My record shall be founded upon reminiscences of my own, aided by those of others, and by published writings of the period. Though my own connection with the movement was far less intimate than that of many who are still living, and though my own name will never pass with theirs to future generations as one of its leaders or of its luminaries; yet for these very reasons I am, in one point of view, perhaps, and in one only, better qualified to bear testimony to it than those who took a more active and prominent part in it; inasmuch as my position in reference to it was more external; as I am not embarrassed by the restraints which personal humility or the obligations of mutual confidence might impose upon them; and as the public may reasonably consider such a witness to make up in independence what he wants in other claims upon its regard. The words with which the great historian of the Peloponnesian War introduces his work are so literally applicable to my own humble task, that I am not deterred from quoting them by the almost ludicrous dissimilarity of the two undertakings, which, for a moment, they bring into juxtaposition. "The transactions of the contest," he says,

* It may be proper to observe that the form of this paper, as of those that will follow, has been somewhat changed, so as to adapt them to the place which the editor of this Review has kindly provided for them in the department of "Essays and Miscellaneous Papers;" yet not so entirely as to remove from some of them, at least, the familiar and colloquial character which suited their original, better than it suits their present, destination.—F. O.

"which I have thought it right to record, are neither related upon hearsay evidence, nor according to the bias of my own opinions; but are such, either as I myself bore personal part in, or as have been reported to me by others, according to the best means of accuracy at my command. Yet is my task not without its difficulties; considering how dependent are our actual impressions upon the caprices of memory, and the vicissitudes of feeling, and that at last our record may be distasteful to many critics just in proportion as it substitutes the true for the fabulous."*

It is no small evidence in favour of the great religious movement in question that we should find so much difficulty in assigning to it a name which is not either unjust towards its real character, or inadequate to its extent and importance. We have no such difficulty about the nomenclature of a heresy or a party agitation; we call the one by the name of the heresiarch, the other by that of the demagogue or popular idol; and such terms, with due allowance for the imperfection of all general appellatives, are sufficient to cover the ground of the idea they represent without going beyond it. But who shall include within the limits of a brief definition, still less express by the force of a simple term, a religious manifestation which was the result of a simultaneous yet mutually independent stirring of hearts in various places about the same time, rather than of any pre-meditated design and concerted action; whose elements of vitality seemed to float in the air rather than to be confined within the range of a single spot; which its enemies delighted to characterize as an "epidemic"—a phrase which its friends were not unwilling to accept, in so far as it implied that their work was not so much propagated by contact as due to unseen agencies which human analysis was unable to investigate, and subject to laws which human power was too weak to oppose? Shall we call it by a name which degrades it to the level of a sect, and identifies it in some exclusive or especial way with an amiable and esteemed divine who, after all, was neither its author nor the most prominent of its leaders? No; for that were to commit an historical error, as well as a controversial discourtesy. Or shall we call it by the name of the University which, if not its home, was at least its head-quarters? That were indeed far truer to facts and free from the vice of personality. Yet, should we call it the Oxford revival, what would Cambridge say which had its share in the work, or London

* Thucyd. lib. i. cap. 22.

which helped it on, or Oscott which smiled upon it? Nay, what would Oxford herself say, that famous university, which, so far from claiming its authors as her own, regarded them as a knot of pestilential agitators; scowled upon them, denounced them, degraded them, and at length drove them from her bosom? Or, lastly, shall we call it the Catholic movement of the Anglican Establishment? But that were to encumber our definition itself with a new controversy, or at least to involve it in a *petitio principii*. On the whole, I am disposed to rest in the modest term, Tractarian; not as being free from material objections, but as being, at any rate, unpretending, univindious, and sufficient for the purpose. For the "Tracts for the Times" certainly contained, one with another, the principles of which the movement, in its ultimate state, was the legitimate development, although some of those who were their authors withdrew from it as it advanced, and even ranged themselves on the side of its enemies.

The theory of party combination by which the opponents of the Tractarian school always endeavoured to weaken its importance, was, from the first, strenuously resisted by its friends, as will be evident to any one who reads, even cursorily, the publications to which it gave rise. That theory was, in fact, the world's usual apology for its own ignorance; an attempt to explain facts which were strange to it upon principles with which it is conversant. But a sufficient answer to the charge of astute complicity is to be found, not merely in the singlemindedness of the principal movers, but in the remarkable differences of character and personal antecedents which distinguished them one from another; differences which they sought neither to conceal by diplomacy, nor to reconcile by compromise. Mr. Newman was unlike both Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble, who were, in their turn, unlike one another; and Mr. Froude, whom Dr. Newman somewhere calls the real author of the movement, had nothing originally in common either with Mr. Newman or Dr. Pusey, except the great abilities which he shared with the former, and the loyalty to the Anglican communion which was common to all.

Between Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble there had once existed a state of feeling which was far from being one of religious sympathy; and Mr. Froude speaks of it as a bright feature in his life that he had been instrumental in bringing these two remarkable men together. The two of these leaders who most resembled one another in personal characteristics were Mr. Keble and Mr. Froude. Both of them sons of High Church clergymen, and, so far, differing at once from Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey, they had imbibed from their earliest years an

affectionate attachment to their Church's system, which became a powerful bond of union when they were brought together as members of the same college at Oxford, although their respective educations had been different, and Mr. Keble was considerably Mr. Froude's senior. The only one of these remarkable men who has passed into the region of history is he who, though the youngest of the whole number in years, deserves to be commemorated as the first who took a comprehensive view of the character and bearings of the movement. Mr. Froude was a college contemporary of my own, and I enjoyed at one time the privilege of constant intercourse and familiar acquaintance with him. Those who have formed their impression of him from his published "*Remains*" will scarcely, perhaps, be prepared to hear how little there appeared in his external deportment, while he was at Oxford, of that remarkable austerity of life which he is now known to have habitually practised even then. To a form of singular elegance, and a countenance of that peculiar and highest kind of beauty which flows from purity of heart and mind, he added manners the most refined and engaging. That air of sunny cheerfulness which is best expressed by the French word *riant*, never forsook him at the time when I knew him best, and diffused itself, as is its wont, over every circle in which he moved. I have seen him in spheres so different as the common-rooms of Oxford and the after-dinner company of the high aristocratic society of the West of England; and I well remember how he mingled even with the last in a way so easy yet so dignified as at once to conciliate its sympathies and direct its tone. He was one of the few who seemed to have extracted good out of an English public-school education, while uninfected by its manifold vices. Popular among his companions from his skill in all athletic exercises, as well as for his humility, forbearance, and indomitable good temper, he had the rare gift of changing the course of dangerous conversation without uncouth abruptness or unbecoming dictation, and almost seemed, as is recorded of S. Bernardine of Siena, to check by his mere presence the profane gibe or unseemly *équivoque*. To his great intellectual powers his published "*Remains*" bear abundant witness; nor do we, in fact, need any other proof of them than the deference yielded to his opinions by such men as those who have acknowledged him for their example and their guide. Let it not be supposed that this high panegyric is prompted by the partiality of friendship. Although I enjoyed constant opportunities of intercourse with Mr. Froude, and made his character a study, yet I have no claim whatever to be considered as his intimate friend. We were not, indeed, at that time, in

anything like complete religious accord; and I remember his once saying to me, in words which subsequent events make me regard as prophetic, "My dear O., I believe you will come right some day, but you are a long time about it." Poor Hurrell Froude! may it be allowed to one who was your competitor in more than one academical contest, and your inferior in everything save in his happy possession of those religious privileges which you were cut off too early to allow of your attaining, to pay you, after many years, this feeble tribute of gratitude and admiration. Never again will Anglicanism produce such a disciple—never, till she is Catholic, will Oxford boast of such a son:—

Hunc tantum terris ostendunt fata, neque ultra
Esse sinent. Nimum vobis Romana propago
Visa potens, superi, propria hæc si dona fuissent.
Nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
In tantum spe tollet avos; nec Romula quondam
Ullo se tantum tellus jactabit alumno.

As I have begun this quotation, I may as well go on with it:—

Heu pietas, heu prisca fides, invictaque bello
Dextera! non illi quisquam se impune tulisset
Obvius armato.
. manibus date lilia plenis;
Purpureos spargam flores, animamque [sodalis]
His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani
Munere.*

To adjust such a character with Catholic facts and Catholic principles is no part of my present object. The reader who takes an interest in this question will find it discussed in Dr. Newman's "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties."† For me, it will be sufficient to take leave of this gifted person in the well-known words, "*Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!*"‡

The characteristic differences which undoubtedly existed among the great leaders of the Tractarian school, although they had no effect—at least for a long time—in marring that front of external unity which the movement itself presented to the public, were not unknown to those who were near the scene of action, and did not wholly escape the notice of keen observers, even at a distance. It soon came to be felt that both Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble, but especially the former,

* Virg. *Æn.* lib. vi. ad fin.

† Lecture XI.

‡ Since such thou art, ah! would thou hadst been ours.

were considerably in advance of Dr. Pusey in their opinions, as well as materially different from him in *ἡθoς*; and that the principal ground of these differences related, more or less directly, to the proper mode of conducting the controversy with Rome. It was not that Mr. Newman had spoken less strongly than Dr. Pusey upon the alleged corruptions of the Church; for, in fact, he had spoken even more strongly against those supposed corruptions. Still, notwithstanding some painful passages, in one of his works, there was throughout Mr. Newman's writings an undercurrent of sympathy with many parts of the Catholic system which led to the apprehension that these apparent antipathies were *in* him, rather than *of* him—views incidental to his position, which, as a humble disciple of Anglicanism, he felt himself bound to adopt in uninquiring faith, rather than those at which he might have arrived, had he, in a less dutiful spirit, permitted his great intellect to stray in the direction of its congenial speculations. No careful student of the works of the two men could doubt that the bias of Dr. Pusey's mind, and that of Mr. Newman's, were in divergent, if not even opposite directions. But a tangible point of difference between them soon appeared in scarcely disguised form before the observant public. This difference, though it might be represented as relating merely to a point of history, touched, as a matter of fact, very closely upon the essential character of the controversy. It concerned the peculiar opinions and objects of the Anglican Reformers, and therein, by consequence, the theological aspect of the Anglican Reformation. Dr. Pusey had publicly come forward in defence of the orthodoxy of Ridley and Jewell.

The estimate taken, on the contrary, of these men and of their work, by Mr. Froude, Mr. Keble, and Mr. Newman, became sufficiently manifest on the publication of Mr. Froude's "*Remains*," with the remarks prefixed to them by the friends just mentioned. Mr. Froude had described the English Reformers in general as a "set with whom he wished to have less and less to do." He declared his opinion that Bishop Jewell was no better than an "irreverent dissenter," and expressed himself as sceptical whether Latimer (of whom, as a "martyr," he did not wish to speak disrespectfully) were not "something in the Bulteel line." * Dr. Pusey was too humble and forbearing to enter any kind of public protest against statements and views so different from his own. But he was

* See Froude's "*Remains*," vol. i. pp. 251, 379. Mr. Bulteel was a clergyman of the Low Church school, who eventually, I believe, joined the Dissenters.

generally believed not to go along with the tenour of these expressions, nor to approve any otherwise than by passive acquiescence of the publication of those parts of the work in which they were contained.

Such personal differences as existed among the leaders of the Tractarian party, were anything rather than unfavourable to the progress of the movement. In the eyes of friendly critics they furnished an attestation of its sincerity, but they likewise tended to disarm opposition where they did not altogether succeed in conciliating attachment. They formed links of connection between the several leaders and various classes of men throughout the University and the country. Those who did not like one of these leaders could fall back upon another. With able and thoughtful persons, of whatever party, Mr. Newman's name was a sufficient guarantee for the intellectual depth of the opinions; sober and quiet-going churchmen, who did not altogether relish Mr. Newman's and Dr. Pusey's religious antecedents, were diverted from their opposition by the well-known orthodoxy of Mr. Keble. Even the Evangelicals (at least the more religious portion of them), who detested this new manifestation of a theology so essentially opposed to their own, were almost won to forbearance, if not to some kind of sympathy, by the fervid piety of Dr. Pusey; while Mr. Froude's frankness and attractive personal qualities gained from the rising generation of Oxford a favourable hearing for the (to them) original views which he so ably and dashingy inculcated.

We are here, throughout, considering the movement in its earlier stages. The minds which it drew towards itself at a later period had been formed on a type very different from that of those with which we have been hitherto engaged; and the argument for its depth and reality was thus proportionately strengthened. A more motley group of adherents than it exhibited some years later it is difficult for imagination even to conceive. But it is fair to add that these adhesions were followed by the defection of many among its earliest supporters, and, as time went on, had the effect of completely splitting it in two.

So much, then, for the evidence of depth and solidity which the Tractarian movement derives from its having commended itself to more than one character of mind. I will now say a few words upon a point which is constantly insisted on by its great leaders throughout their published works—I mean the fact that it was not new, but had been, in a measure, anticipated by men who had preceded it, and foreshown by many significant prognostics. One quotation to this effect may

suffice, and it shall be taken from Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf in vindication of the 90th Tract :—

"I have always contended," he says, "and will contend, that it (the religious revival) is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways, and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, still all bear witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something, and, most unhappily, the one religious communion which has of late years been practically in possession of this something is the Church of Rome."*

I pass over the latter words of this quotation, which constitute one of those tokens to which I have already adverted of the illustrious author's irrepressible sympathies with the Catholic Church. For I am here speaking of its general subject. I do not know that I altogether agree with the illustrious writer as to the individuals whom he has selected for the exemplification of his remarks; but this very probably arises from my own imperfect acquaintance with their writings. At any rate, with the large qualification by which he guards his statement, I should be disposed to add some other names to those which he has specified. In the wide sense of desiring to rise above the thoroughly worldly character of the poetry, philosophy, and divinity of the last century, I should be inclined to couple the name of Cowper with that of Wordsworth among poets, of Burke and Johnson with Coleridge among philosophers, and, in an eminent degree, of William Wilberforce with those religious men who, with whatever excusable deficiencies of doctrine, were almost the first, as a class, to treat sin and grace, and heaven and hell, as practical and urgent realities.

But, to come now to more proximate causes of the Tractarian movement. I am disposed to give a very prominent place among these causes to the teaching of Dr. Charles Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford, who died in 1829, about four years before the publication of the "Tracts for the Times." Bishop Lloyd was, I believe, the first to introduce the admirable practice, since adopted by all his successors in the Divinity chair at Oxford, of giving private instruction to candidates for the Anglican ministry, as well as the public lectures which have always been customary. The class of pupils whom Dr. Lloyd assembled between the years

* Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, pp. 25, 26.

1826 and 1828 comprehended all the forementioned leaders of the great Tractarian movement, with the exception of Mr. Keble, who had then left the University. I was myself one of that class, though junior in standing to Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman; and this, therefore, is one of the subjects of these essays in which my testimony is drawn from personal experience. Among other matters which Dr. Lloyd read and discussed with his class was the history of the Council of Trent and that of the Anglican Prayer-book. There were, of course, two ways of treating both of these subjects; but Dr. Lloyd chose the more correct and Catholic one. And I have no doubt whatever that his teaching had a most important influence upon the movement, and—a point to which I wish to draw particular attention—upon that movement in its ultimate and, as I may call it, Roman stage. Upon the subjects of Church Authority, Episcopacy, the Apostolical Succession, and others, with which the earlier Tracts were almost exclusively occupied, I do not remember to have derived any very definite ideas from Dr. Lloyd's teaching; but I do remember to have received from him an entirely new notion of Catholics and of Catholic doctrine. The fact was that Dr. Lloyd, besides being a man of independent thought considerably in advance of the High Churchmen of his time, had enjoyed in his youth many opportunities of intercourse with the French emigrant clergy, to whom he was indebted, as he told us, for truer views of the Catholic religion than were generally current in this country. But his contributions to our future privilege did not end here. In his lectures on the Anglican Prayer-book he made us first acquainted with the Missal and Breviary as the sources from which all that is best and noblest in that compilation is derived; and I have at this time, or lately had, an interleaved Book of Common Prayer with the references to the original sources side by side with the translated passages. It may be easily imagined what an outcry these lectures would have created a few years later; but in the peace and security which then reigned controversy was never thought of on any side, and a favourable opportunity was thus given for casting on the wide waters that bread which was to reappear after many days. Dr. Lloyd's own course was soon run, and came to an abrupt and somewhat melancholy end. Upon the adoption of the great measure of Catholic Emancipation by the Government of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel in 1829, Dr. Lloyd, who owed his bishopric to the friendly intervention of the latter statesman (who had been his pupil), was found in the ranks of its episcopal supporters. Those who, like myself, knew the bias of his mind, could understand how this fact

was sufficiently explained by his general spirit of fairness and forbearance towards Catholics; but the world at large, who had known him only as a High Churchman of Tory principles, attributed his change of opinion to the most unworthy motives; and, being a man of strong feelings, he was unable to bear up against the imputation. Knowing that his vote with ministers would require an apology, he supported it by an eloquent speech, which, in the then prejudiced state of the public mind, only made matters worse. I had the privilege of hearing that speech—it was, in the main, a vindication of Catholic doctrines against Protestant misrepresentation. It led to a bitter altercation with Lord Chancellor Eldon. The Bishop charged the Chancellor with being a mere tyro in logic, and the Chancellor replied, not unnaturally, that such language was fitter for the class-room at Oxford than for their lordships' House. Dr. Lloyd, who was always very kind to me, sent for me the next morning to his lodgings, and I found him literally flushed with his oratorical triumph. In fact, he plainly manifested the symptoms of an incipient fever, which in six weeks resulted in his death. The sad interval was full of events calculated to aggravate the malady. The week after his Parliamentary display he appeared at the *levée*, where the King (George IV.), who regarded the support of Catholic emancipation as a personal insult, treated him with pointed rudeness. What he regarded as a far greater mortification than the rebuff he had experienced from a capricious monarch, was that at his visitation, which followed soon after, the great body of his own clergy refused his invitation to dinner. Vexed and bitterly disappointed, he took to his bed, and a few days later expired—an impressive example of the worthlessness of human success, but a victim, as we may hope, of his zeal in the cause of charity and justice.

Among the facts which heralded in the Tractarian movement and helped, as I must think, towards its real success, was the publication of Mr. Keble's "Christian Year," and its almost unexampled popularity. I am afraid to say how many large editions this work went through in a comparatively short time. It was in everyone's hands; admired by literary men for its poetical beauty, and loved by religious minds for its calm and deep spirit of devotion. Appearing at a time when controversy was not suspected, it was the occasion of circulating—and that too in the form of all others the most attractive and the most valuable—sentiments which, if ever they had a place in the Anglican schools of divinity, had, at all events, been long in abeyance. Not only was it free, to an extent at that time remarkable, from anti-Catholic phraseology,

but it dared to plead, in terms than which even a Catholic could use no stronger, for the love of which our Blessed Lady should be the object.* The natural and affectionate use of the Holy Name was another of its characteristics, which, strange to say, placed it in contrast to the High Church publications of the time, and won for it an access to many an Evangelical hearth from which the well-known religious opinions of its author might otherwise have banished it. The work was thus, in all probability, the means of insinuating principles, and infusing a spirit, which prepared the way for a more favourable reception of the Tractarian theology than that theology might have received if not pre-announced by so popular a forerunner.

I cannot help thinking, although I am not sure if the opinion be shared by others, that the great religious movement in question was favoured to a considerable extent by the peculiar character of the education, both philosophical and classical, by which the Oxford of those days was distinguished. The basis of the former was the great moral treatise of Aristotle, the *Ethics*, which contains, as I need not say, the skeleton of our own system of Moral Theology. The Aristotelian ethics, with the Christian philosophy of Bishop Butler as their commentary and supplement, entered into the academical education of all the more cultivated minds of Oxford, and contributed, in a pre-eminent degree, to form their character and regulate their tone. In the absence of anything like a powerful and consistent teaching on the part of the Established Church, this positive philosophy was a real boon. Those, of course, who had no higher object in their academical life than to gain the honours of the Schools, studied this philosophy, like everything else, with an eye merely to that secondary end. But more thoughtful minds found in it a deeper meaning and a more practical use. No one can read Mr. Froude's "*Remains*," for instance, without seeing, that with him, and with those with whom he corresponded, the ethical system of Oxford had exercised no small influence in the formation of mental habits. Those who, like myself, were personally acquainted with Mr. Froude, will remember how constantly he used to appeal to this great moral teacher of antiquity, ("Old 'Stotle," as he used playfully to call him,) against the shallow principles of the day.† There is a sense, I am convinced, in which the

* Ave Maria, thou whose name
All but adoring love may claim.

Christian Year: Feast of the Annunciation.

† Mr. Froude's "*Letters to Friends*" furnish abundant evidence of a mind formed upon the best Oxford model. (See "*Remains*," vol. i. pp. 170, 249, 329, 363, 367-8, 375-6, &c.)

literature of heathenism is often more religious than that of Protestantism. Thus, then, it was that the philosophical studies of Oxford tended to form certain great minds on a semi-Catholic type.

I wish I had space to do more than indicate a similar impression with regard to the (then) classical education of Oxford, which made critical scholarship less an end in itself, than the means towards a certain habit of mind. It was an education which fed the chivalrous and romantic spirit of youth, and which formed those capacities for the perception of the beautiful, of which the Catholic religion is the sole adequate correlative. Hence those accomplished scholars of the olden time, who have not become Catholics, such as Mr. Keble and Mr. Isaac Williams, have been apt to invest their own religion with an ideal beauty, which has been to them, unhappily, a kind of substitute for the reality. Meanwhile, where is it but in the Catholic Church, her storied annals, her world-wide exploits, her awful sanctity, her varied devotions, her versatile institutions, her graceful and loving ceremonial, that romance finds its noblest field of investigation, and the love of the beautiful its most congenial sphere of exercise? The natural reverence of Æschylus, the all but inspired flights of Pindar, the philosophic vein of the reflective Sophocles, the fascinating elegance of Virgil, and even the pathetic moralism of the voluptuous Horace,—where do they find the light which illustrates their instinctive guesses, the substance which corresponds with their dim foreshadowings, the agent which precipitates their dross and brings out their gold? In the theory, the history, and the actual manifestations of Holy Church.*

It was about the year 1833 that the Tractarian movement actually took its rise, in the publication of the first of the "Tracts for the Times." The more immediate occasion of this attempt to reanimate the Established Church with the spirit of ancient times, is said by Mr. William Palmer, of Worcester College, in his "Narrative of Events" connected with the publication of the Tracts, to have been the exhibition on the part of the Government of an increasing desire to subject the National Church to the influence of the State; and the destruction of the ancient landmarks which had separated the Establishment, on the one hand from the Roman Catholics,

* For an illustration, I might point to the "Promessi Sposi," or to "Fabiola." It is hardly necessary for me to say that I am not here pronouncing any opinion upon the *religious* advantages of a classical education *in the abstract*. The case of Oxford was in more than one respect quite peculiar, and wholly independent of that complicated question.

and on the other from the Dissenters, by the then recent repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the emancipation of Catholics from civil disabilities, and other measures of a similar character. Those who desire to acquaint themselves with the circumstances under which the Tracts arose, and the differences of opinion which were the cause of division among their authors almost from the first, and ultimately of a complete separation of the more backward from the more advanced disciples of the school, will do well to consult Mr. Palmer's "Narrative," which will be found to bear out some of the remarks contained in the present essay.

The objects with which the Tracts were originally started will sufficiently account for the tenour of those which came earliest in the series. The earlier numbers will be found to turn principally upon the points in which the Established Church is supposed to mediate between the two extremes of "Romanism" and Latitudinarianism, as well as upon the claims of that body to a share in those hereditary privileges of an Apostolic society which Catholics consider to have been fatally impaired by the great schism of the sixteenth century. This portion of the subject has so little interest for Catholics, whom alone I am here addressing, that I gladly follow the dictate of my own inclination by passing it over. In truth it is a phase of the movement which never presented any features of attraction either to my own mind or to that of others whom the movement eventually absorbed into itself. I can confidently assert that the hardest trial to which my faith was ever exposed was that of being asked to see in the Anglican bishops the successors of the Apostles. I have not a word to say against those prelates, many of whom were amiable and estimable men; but to look upon them, in their collective character, as the lineal descendants of St. Peter and St. Paul was another matter altogether. It was not the seat in the Lords, for that might be an accident; nor the *congé d'élire*, for that might be an usurpation. Neither was it altogether the handsome equipage and the numerous retinue, the palace with its imposing exterior, or the castle with its princely domain, for these might, without much difficulty, be located in the Catholic system: they had their counterparts in Catholic countries, and some of them were even the heritage of Catholic times. But it was those characteristics of the institution which appeal rather to the imagination than to the reason which made havoc of the illusion: the peculiar phenomena of the individuals, their families, and their establishments—the air of profound official serenity and dogged domesticity which floated around them—these it was which, antecedently to all investigation, and as an

almost insuperable preliminary prejudice to it, seemed to imply some fatal flaw in the Apostolic pedigree, and to indicate some bar of illegitimacy athwart the royal escutcheon. Nor did it seem any injustice to the persons in question to hesitate in attributing to them prerogatives which, for a long time at least, they appeared to be themselves as anxious to disclaim as others to force upon them. Those respectable men had been in the habit of regarding themselves but as dignified gentlemen; when lo! they suddenly woke up to the consciousness that they were successors of the Apostles. They looked around them, about them, and within them: "*Miranturque novas frondes, et non sua poma.*" Far from realizing the magnitude of the claim, they were at first so bewildered by its novelty as scarcely to be able to understand its nature. Was it an increase of work, or an accession of dignity?—a weapon in the hand, or a feather in the cap?—a demand upon vigilance, or an occasion of "doing homage?" As time went on, however, they found the use of their new power. Those who had preached up episcopal authority had preached as its correlative the duty of implicit obedience. Though others might dispute their new title, and did so, yet in one quarter at least they were sure of finding a practical recognition of it; on the part of those, namely, to whom they were indebted for its donation. For many a long day they had lamented the powerlessness of their threats and the inefficacy of their commands. But better times were at hand: they could now fulminate with freedom and charge with vigour, for they were sure not only of a patient hearing but of a willing submission. And charge they did, on the right hand and on the left; from north to south, and from east to west—from Durham to Salisbury, and from Lincoln to Llandaff,—and soon the captives were to be seen crouching in their cells, their limbs crippled with fetters and manacles of their own forging; while he who was the principal object of the aim lay prostrate on the ground like a stricken eagle, the victim of the arrow which himself had plumed.*

Had the influence of the Tractarian movement been confined within the range of mere literature, it might have been very many years in spreading itself; and, in all probability, would never have succeeded in gaining that hold on the public mind, which, as a fact, it asserted with almost miraculous rapidity. Literature proper has but a slender influence on human action unless when powerfully aided by collateral supports or by the predisposition of the public. Neither of these auxiliaries was

* For a most humorous description of this situation, see Dr. Newman's "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties." (Sect. v. pp. 125-6; first ed.)

actually wanting in the case of the Tracts. They evidently responded to some craving which was not felt to exist till its satisfaction was supplied. But the teaching of the Tracts also required for its due effect some vast machinery of oral instruction to explain, to amplify, and to qualify it. For it consisted, as truly understood, not in certain doctrines only, but in a great ethical system, by which the whole character was to be leavened, and not merely the reason convinced. The place in which the movement arose was, of all others, the most favourable for this purpose. The University of Oxford is both a centre which draws to itself all that is powerful in this country, and a source from which those elements return to their several spheres of influence with an immense accession of strength, whether for good or for evil. Moreover, Oxford possesses, so far as a Protestant University can possess it, a most valuable apparatus of oral teaching. Its lecture-rooms in the several colleges furnish, to those who preside in them, abundant means of moulding the ductile mind of youth in one or another form; while its pulpits, parochial as well as academical, where filled by able and earnest preachers, may easily be made, as they have been made, materially instrumental to the same end. The former of these means of influence—the lecture-room—was all but completely barred, by the exercise of authority, against the approaches of Tractarianism. Tutors of colleges who were known to share the new opinions, were speedily disposed of by some one among those hundred methods of regulating his society according to his own views which the head of a college possesses; while younger men who might be aspirants after the same position were still more easily prevented from ever arriving at it. Many methods would occur to the anti-Tractarian president or master for the attainment of his object. He might crush the spirit of the unhappy juvenile by snubbing him at collections, by quarrelling with his exercises, by cold looks and cutting words at other times; and, as a last resource, by sending him upon some plea of health or college necessity into the country. These methods of petty persecution, which were extensively resorted to in the hope of checking the progress of Tractarianism among the junior members of the University, have been so admirably described by Dr. Newman in his inimitable tale of “*Loss and Gain*,” that no more need be said of them in this place. Even the higher tribunals of the University were sometimes perverted to the same party uses. The candidate for a B.A. degree was often obliged to choose between the risk of losing his “*testamur*” or his honours, and the necessity of declaring, at the dictation of his examiner, that the Mass was a fatal error; Purgatory a

“fond thing;” and Roman Catholics the true modern representatives of the Jewish Pharisees; and, as Tractarians were apt to be troubled with tender consciences, the result of the alternative was generally against them. Even the School of Divinity was turned into a court of inquisition; and on a celebrated occasion the Regius Professor of that faculty endeavoured to convert a zealous admirer of Tractarian principles by refusing him his degree, unless he would consent to accept a thesis so worded by the Professor as to admit but of one mode of treatment, and to treat it according to the views of doctrine which he (the Professor) espoused.

But the other instrument of moral power to which allusion has been made—the pulpit—was not quite so manageable a weapon. The University pulpit, indeed, had a two-sided effect upon the movement; for the conditions of that institution entail a constant variety of preachers; and, as the Tractarians were of course in the minority, their sermons bore a very small proportion to those of their opponents. And almost every hot-headed parson who came from the country to preach before the University in his turn, came with a determination to crush the iniquitous system by some palmary argument similar to that by which the Scotchman proposed to convert the Pope. But, all this while a course of pulpit-teaching was going on in the same church, which, unlike that we have just spoken of, was continuous and uniform. No sooner had St. Mary’s been cleared of its dignified audience, than a new congregation was gathered together within its walls, ostensibly consisting of parishioners, but really comprehending a large number of the members, especially the junior members, of the University. This service, like its companion in the forenoon, was conducted entirely by Mr. Newman, who had succeeded, in his turn, as Fellow of Oriel, to the incumbency of the parish. Mr. Newman was, in fact, everything in this office—alike without rival and without coadjutor; he was reader, preacher, and celebrant; nay, music and ceremonial also; for, if these various departments were ever actually filled by others, they have faded from the memory, which has settled down on him alone. It was from that pulpit that Sunday after Sunday were delivered those marvellous discourses which have been since collected into several volumes, and of which it may be said that there is hardly a sentence which does not form a study for the philosopher. Nor was it in the pulpit alone that Mr. Newman had the gift of throwing a character essentially his own over the work in which he was engaged. He succeeded in imparting to the Anglican service, and especially to that portion of it which from the lips of most clergymen

was either an unimpressive recital or a pompous effort—the reading of the lessons—an indescribable charm of touching beauty, and a wonderful power of instructive efficacy. His delivery of Scripture was a sermon in which you forgot the human preacher; a drama in which the vividness of the representation was marred by no effort and degraded by no art. He stood before the sacred volume as if penetrating its contents to their very centre, so that his manner alone, his pathetic changes of voice, or his thrilling pauses, seemed to convey the commentary in the simple enunciation of the text. He brought out meanings where none had been even suspected, and invested passages which in the hands of the profane are often the subject of unbecoming levity, with a solemnity which forced irreverence to retire abashed into its hiding-places. In fact, for a non-Catholic ministration, nothing could be more perfect. It is the Church alone which completely merges the individual in the office, and which can afford, therefore, to dispense with every form of rhetorical embellishment, however legitimate, in the utterance of prayer or the recital of the Written Word. But I have often regarded Mr. Newman's mode of reading the lessons, with the inimitable power of representation which he threw into them, as a kind of foreshadowing; or, as I may say, apologetic counterpart, of that sublime idea which the Church has embodied in the quasi-dramatic recital of the Passion in Holy Week.

The charm of the ministration to which I have just referred had scarcely less effect in securing the presence, and rivetting the attention, of a devout and highly educated congregation than the masterly discourses which followed it. There were particular chapters of the Old Testament (for, as it was evening service of which I am speaking, the narrative portion of the New did not enter into the lessons), to the recurrence of which people used almost to look forward as master specimens of the peculiar power in question. The sacrifice of Isaac by his father, the history of Joseph and his brethren, the passage of the Red Sea, and the history of Balaam, are portions of the Old Testament which gave especial opportunity for its exercise. Ah! it might almost make one weep to think of the change which has come over that University; of the blight of scepticism and infidelity which has penetrated, to all appearance, to its core, and poisoned the very well-springs of faith and love. Unhappy Oxford!—

Not poppy nor mandragora,
Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,
Shall ever med'cine thee to that sweet sleep
Which thou owedst yesterday.

The spirit of confidence has fled; the demon of mistrust has entered in; and there is no charmer now to lure it away by the music of his song; no exorcist to bid it avaunt by the power of his word. One panacea alone remains—the authority of an infallible Church, and the gift of a childlike faith.

The second act of the drama which I am engaged in evolving, opens with the publication of the celebrated 90th Tract, upon which, if such be the editor's kind pleasure, the curtain shall rise in a future paper.

Before concluding, however, I must briefly advert to an event which belongs to the period we have just traversed, and not to that upon which we have still to enter. Mr. Froude had now passed away from the scene of his earthly labours. Towards the close of his mortal career his opinions appear to have undergone some change, which was perceptible to many of his friends even in his outward demeanour. He associated less than formerly with the old High Church party of the Establishment, as he became convinced that the ills of the Church must be cured by sterner and more unworldly methods of discipline than that party was prepared to accept. An air of gravity and a tone of severity, even in general society (so far as he mixed with it), had replaced that bright and sunny cheerfulness which was characteristic of his earlier days; and this change of exterior was greater than could be explained by his declining health, against which he bore up with exemplary fortitude. Together with a more anxious view of the state and prospects of the Establishment, he had apparently taken up a less favourable opinion of the Catholic Church, at least, in its actual manifestation. A visit to the Continent had operated, from whatever cause, unfavourably upon his judgment of Catholics, whom he now first stigmatized as "Tridentines,"—a strange commentary, certainly, on the view put forth later by Mr. Newman, to the effect that the prevalent Catholic system was erroneous, in that it had deviated from the Tridentine rule,—not in that it represented that rule. This and similar dicta (some of a still more painful import) have led such of Mr. Froude's friends as have clung to the Established Church to believe that, had he lived, he would have remained on their side. Such a question will naturally be determined, to a great extent, according to the personal views and wishes of those who speculate upon it. Certain, at any rate, it is that, had he come to us, the Church would have secured the humble obedience and faithful service of a rarely gifted intellect; while, had he stayed behind, he would have added one more to the number of those whose absence is the theme of our lamentation, and whose conversion the object of our prayers.

It is part, however, of the historian's office to investigate such questions according to the evidence at his disposal; and, in the instance before us, that evidence is far more accessible and far more satisfactory than is usually the case in post-humous inquiries. Mr. Froude's "Letters to Friends," published in his "Remains," give an insight into his character and feelings, with all their various developments and vicissitudes, such as is commonly the privilege of intimate personal acquaintance, and of that alone. His bosom friends could hardly have known him better than the careful student of these letters may know him, if he desire it; indeed, it is to such friends that he discloses himself in those letters with almost the plain-spokenness of the confessional.

Now it must be admitted that these letters leave the question as to the probability of his conversion very much in that evenly-balanced state in which, as we have just said, the wishes of friends or partisans come in to determine it on either side. His letters contain, on the one hand, many passages from which, if they stood alone, it might be concluded that he was, at certain times, almost ripe for conversion. They also contain others apparently of an opposite tenour. In the former class must be reckoned those indications of antipathy, continually deriving fresh fuel from new researches, to the English Reformation and Reformers.* Mr. Froude's theological sentiments had long passed the mark of the Laudian era, and settled at the point of the Non-jurors.† He thinks "one might take" for an example "Francis de Sales," whom, by the way, he classes with Jansenist saints.‡ Again, he was most deeply sensitive to the shortcomings and anomalies of his communion; he calls it an "incubus" on the country, and ascribes to it the blighting properties of the "upas-tree."§ It is evident that he was in advance both of Mr. Keble and of Mr. Newman: he twits the former, in friendly expostulation, with the Protestantism of his phraseology in parts of the "Christian Year," and laments the backwardness of the latter on some questions of the day.|| On the other hand, and in the same direction of thought, he expresses admiration of Cardinal Pole;¶ he scruples about speaking against the Catholic system—even its "*seemingly indifferent practices*;"** he can understand, on the principle of reverence,

* Froude's Remains, vol. i. pp. 389, 393, 394, &c.

† Ibid. p. 363.

‡ Ibid. p. 395.

§ Ibid. pp. 403, 405, &c.

|| Ibid. pp. 326, 394, 395, 403, 417, &c.

¶ Ibid. p. 254.

** Ibid. pp. 336, 395.

the communion under one species *—perhaps the greatest of all practical difficulties to many Anglican minds. Moreover, when at Rome, he evidently opened the subject of reconciliation to a distinguished prelate whom he met there.†

Per contra, we have painful sayings against supposed practical abuses in the Church. He “really thought,” as he tells us, “that certain practices” which he witnessed abroad are “idolatrous;” he charges priests with irreverence, ecclesiastical authorities with laxity, &c.‡ Yet even these opinions he partially qualifies, and is disposed to attribute to defective information.§ He shrinks from speaking against Rome “as a Church” (p. 395).

Unwilling as I am to hazard conjectures on the subject, especially against the judgment of any among his more intimate friends, I do not think it unreasonable to conclude, from a comparison of these passages, that Mr. Froude’s objections were chiefly directed against imaginary abuses, or possible relaxations of discipline, which time and reflection would have shown him to be entirely independent of the real merits of the controversy. I find it also difficult to believe that, as the principles of the English Reformation received those illustrations in the Established Church which we have lived long enough to see,—as her constituted tribunals were found to give up in succession the grace of the Sacraments, the authority of the Church, and even the inspiration of Holy Scripture itself, as necessary truths,—his clear and honest mind would not have accepted some or all of these tokens of apostasy as a summons to enter the True Fold. Assuredly, too, we have known no instance of a mind equally candid, intelligent, and instructed, whose advances in the direction of the Truth (especially where assisted by extraordinary acuteness of conscience and purity of life) have stopped short, as time has gone on, of the logical conclusion, except in cases where the progress of such a mind has been arrested by conflicting tendencies of deeply ingrained Protestant or national prepossession—such as in his instance were singularly absent.

There is, however, one phase of Mr. Froude’s mind with which it is far more difficult to reconcile the belief of his probable conversion than any other. This phase, indeed, seems to have been a characteristic of himself, as compared

* Froude’s Remains, vol. i. p. 410. See the passage, “*If I were a Roman Catholic Priest*,” &c.

† Ibid. p. 306.

‡ These passages are collected in the Editor’s Preface to the “Remains,” p. 11, et seq.

§ See Preface, p. 14, et alibi.

with nearly all of those who took a leading part in the movement, including even Mr. Keble, who, on the whole, was the nearest to Mr. Froude in general character. The peculiarity to which I refer, is that of an extraordinary leaning to the side of religious dread, and a corresponding suppression of the sentiments of love and joy. Mr. Froude's religion, so far as it can be gathered from his published journal, seems to have been (if the expression be not too strong) more like that of a humble and pious Jew under the Old Dispensation, than of a Christian living in the full sunshine of Gospel privileges. The apology for this feature in his religious character, and for any portion of it which appears in those of other excellent men of the same period, is to be found in the ungraceful and often irreverent form in which the warmer side of the Christian temper was exhibited in the party called by courtesy Evangelical, whose language, based as it was upon grievous errors of doctrine, had a tendency to react in religious minds on the side of severity and reserve. Such a form of religious spirit, however, when exhibited in the somewhat unusual proportions which it assumes in Mr. Froude, must undergo almost a complete revolution before it can be naturally susceptible of the impressions which Catholic devotion has a tendency to produce, or even tolerant of the language which pervades our approved manuals. It is certainly difficult to find in the Mr. Froude of the "Remains" a compartment for devotion to our Blessed Lady, for instance, or even to the Sacred Humanity of our Lord, in all its attractive and endearing fulness. Yet, taking the phenomena of his case as a whole, and duly estimating the respective powers of the two conflicting forces, I cannot help thinking that the Church would more easily have conquered his prejudices than the Establishment have retained his allegiance.

FREDERICK OAKELEY.

(To be continued.)

THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.

[The paper that follows is from the pen of an excellent Catholic, who has access to unusually good sources of information on the subject of which he treats, and whose opinions are worthy of most respectful consideration. We believe, therefore, that we do our readers a service in publishing his remarks.]

ABOUT a month ago the French world was taken by surprise; and though a few wiseacres had sapiently nodded their heads, and foretold some sort of modification in the Imperial system of government, yet the public in general had not expected such a thorough change in the heavings and workings of that dark spirit which, either for good or for evil, rules at present over Europe. And so—again I repeat it—France was taken by surprise. However, when the first burst of astonishment was over, every reflective mind felt that this new move on the part of the Emperor in the right direction was, after all, the effect of a certain cause, the practical result of a long string of leading circumstances. Leaving metaphor aside, the late changes wrought in the French Cabinet by the Arch-will, were due to the General Elections of 1863. So, all of a sudden, the grand elector M. de Persigny marched out of the Home Department; whilst three other ministers, M. Delangle, M. Rouland, and M. Walewski, were politely waved out of the Cabinet. Again, M. Baroche, who for twelve long years has been labouring like a galley-slave, both in the Corps Législatif and in the Council of State, is allowed at last to court a more quiet life in the Ministry of Justice and Public Worship. This poor man, so lately buffeted about and bruised by his quarrelsome friend, De Persigny, must surely exclaim with the poet:—

*Libertas : quæ sera, tamen respexit inertem ;
Candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat :
Respexit tamen, et longo post tempore venit.*

Whilst he adds, surely, in the secret of his own heart:—

————— *Deus nobis hæc otia fecit.*

The god, indeed, has spoken; and the same powerful words which made the above-mentioned gentlemen topple down from their heights, have likewise conjured up new puppets, destined

to dance awhile before an applauding public, whilst the *impresario* holds the wires behind the scenes, and prepares to whistle the same song, though in a different key.

These new men are, after all, but old ones, dressed out in an Imperial garb. M. Boudet, who has superseded M. de Persigny, is a veteran of the antiquated parliamentary system, as well as a long-standing friend of M. Billault's, who presided over a section of the Council of the State. He likewise superintends the management of the *Moniteur*, by no means an unimportant engine under the present system. M. Boudet is well known for his eminent administrative qualifications; and this is a high encomium when applied to the successor of a man who was noted for his utter disregard of every rule and exigency belonging to the usual routine of his office.

Another Minister, M. Armand Béhic, had likewise made himself known, before 1848, as a hard-working and highly intelligent director, who in our own country would probably have ranked with Sir G. Cornwall Lewis, or any other praiseworthy practical statesman. In France, he had lately given new proofs of his capacity as the able manager of the Mediterranean and Atlantic Company (*Compagnie des Messageries Impériales*), which bids fair to compete successfully with our best Transatlantic undertakings. M. Béhic now holds the post of Minister of Commerce and of Public Works.

As for M. Duruy, the new Minister for Public Instruction, his appointment is not only surprising, but borders somewhat upon the romantic. He held a professorship in one of the Parisian grammar-schools, and, probably to eke out the pecuniary shortcomings of his official station, had successively published several historical class-books, which enjoyed a well-earned reputation. The Emperor, in his own studies relative to old Cæsar, happened some time ago to read M. Duruy's Roman History, and was struck with many of its leading features. He consequently sought for an interview with the author, which ended in the latter placing himself at the disposal of his Imperial Master. Little by little a sort of intimacy grew up between them; and it is almost needless to add that M. Duruy was by no means the loser by their mutual intercourse, having rapidly risen in the ranks of the State University, and still more so, perhaps, in the Sovereign's favour. This does not in the slightest degree imply any servile spirit on the part of the new Minister, who, if reports speak true, was no less astonished than other people at his elevation to such a high place of trust and confidence. M. Duruy appears to be a man of liberal feelings and opinions, but, unfortunately, he is known to be hostile to the temporal power of the Pope; and

some of his bosom friends whisper that *he* it was who wrote the flaming speeches of M. Bonjean against Rome, during the late session; whilst the noble senator and *alter ego* of Prince Napoleon did little else but learn them by heart. At any rate, the writer of these lines could almost vouch for the truth of the fact; which does not forebode, on the part of M. Duruy, much favour to the clerical schools throughout France.

One of the most remarkable features of the changes lately brought about in the French Cabinet is the abolition of speaking Ministers (*Ministres sans portefeuille*). From the very beginning it was considered as a most awkward and roundabout way of making up for that deficiency in public speakers which unfortunately stamped the late Cabinet. Talkers, indeed, there were some among them, such as M. Rouland for instance; but orators there were none. Yet even the talent of M. Billault and M. Baroche could hardly maintain its ground against the rising Opposition in both houses—when they had to contend with men who, whatever might be their failings in regard to real eloquence, possessed at least that sterling and convincing quality of speaking their own minds and opinions. A Minister "*sans portefeuille*," on the contrary, was merely an echo condemned to repeat another man's words, and to defend measures which at the bottom of his heart he often disapproved, or would have readily cancelled. I could easily produce many proofs of this fact:—let one suffice. M. Billault strongly attacked before the Senate that society of S. Vincent de Paul, which no insinuation, no would-be State reason, could induce him to subvert as long as he himself was at the head of the Home Department.

So, according to the new transformation of the French Government, all intercourse between the Crown and the Chambers must henceforward take place through the medium of M. Billault as Minister of State, and of M. Rouher as President of the Council of State. Both might be termed leaders, though in a very different sense from the meaning an Englishman would attach to that well-known wheel of our parliamentary engine. But, at any rate, the above arrangements, when taken all together, go far beyond a mere change of persons, and must be viewed as an important evolution or alteration in the Imperial system. On the part of Napoleon III. they amount to a praiseworthy attempt to conform his government to a new situation manifested by the general elections. Few monarchs wielding absolute power are keen-sighted enough to read the signs of the coming storm in the deep blue sky of a summer day; fewer still are

they who, having read these signs, are wise enough to seize the helm with a bold hand and steer at once the gallant ship to a safe though distant harbour. The adventurous *parvenu* who is now seated on the throne of France seems a spirit cast in that mould, if we may judge from his past and present. Without launching out into an investigation alike foreign to our general subject, and premature in the present day, it is at least worth our while to take a rapid survey of the internal policy of France during the last six years. It is indeed the only way to apprehend fully the movement which has but just become apparent, and seems destined to end once more in the permanent establishment of liberty. If it be added that the Church will most probably benefit by that liberty—expand under its protection—gain strength and health and beauty from breathing the pure air of freedom—what Catholic reader will not become immediately interested in the following remarks, gleaned from personal observation, and grounded, I may venture to say, on a thorough knowledge of our powerful neighbours?

The period included between 1852 and 1857 may be summed up in two words:—political lethargy. Every man in France seemed absorbed in one engrossing idea:—making money and making order. Making order, I say, because every man's hand would have been instantly raised against the hare-brained adventurer presumptuous enough to think, much less to speak, of a free government or free institutions. Something of the kind must have taken place in Rome when Augustus assumed the reins of power, and when every Roman hastened to worship the rising sun, or, as Tacitus finely expresses it, "*ruere in servitium*." In France, at least, there was some reason for this general disposition to abjure all former principles, and to acknowledge the necessity of a strong hand. I mean the utter absence of respect for any established law or authority, which for years and years had characterized the French nation. If the present Government achieves no greater feat than to instil a feeling of awe into the minds of the people, still it would stand high in the eyes of posterity. In more senses than one are those words true:—"Initium sapientiæ timor Domini."

I insist the more upon this general tendency of every class in France during the first five or six years of the Imperial *régime*, because of late it has become the fashion to forget these times and dispositions. Legitimists, Orleanists, nay, even Republicans themselves, were all glad to get rid of anarchy, or, at least, of a most perilous sort of liberty, wearing

the garb of licence. Here again we are reminded of the Roman historian, when he says in his strong language:—"Cum ferocissimi per vires aut proscriptione cecidissent, ceteri nobilium, quanto quis servitio promptior, opibus et honoribus extollerentur, ac novis ex rebus aucti, tuta et præsentia, quam vetera et periculosa mallent." And I may add, that among the vast body of French peasantry, the very name of Napoleon acted as a charm and a spell that made them fall down upon their knees, and address to a sort of legendary being that worship which many often refused to their God and Maker.

But in a Christian and civilized country such a state of things can never become permanent. At the bottom of every soul redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ there lies, either dormant or awake, a feeling of dignity that instinctively rises against all arbitrary power. As free agents and responsible beings, we soon find out that no earthly prince has a right to rule exclusively over both our minds and bodies. And indeed this is the very reason why among Christian nations anything like heathen or Asiatic despotism is an impossibility; for whatever bad tendencies we may attribute in this direction to the First Napoleon, or to Nicholas of Russia, still in their worst moments did they never come near to the crowned monsters of ancient Rome.

The very first signs of a reaction in France may be traced to the elections of 1857. On the 30th of May in that year M. Billault, then Minister of the Interior, addressed a circular to the prefects, in which he laid down the rules and principles of the Government in regard to the elections. After extolling the services and devotedness of the late Chamber, he declared that, "with very few exceptions, rendered necessary by special circumstances, the Government deemed it both expedient and equitable to present for re-election the members of an Assembly which had deserved so well both of the Emperor and of the country." The reader will do well to bear in mind that, according to the French system, the Administration puts forth, and patronizes by every means at its disposal, a certain number of official candidates, thus assuming the perilous duties of arch-canvasser for the whole Empire. More than one wit has repeatedly asked why the Emperor should not at once appoint the deputies, as he does any other public agent or functionary. The system would certainly have the merit of great simplicity.

That M. Billault was not, however, of such an opinion, is shown by the sequel of his circular, which M. de Persigny might have endorsed in 1863: "Together with those official candidates, openly admitted and resolutely maintained, others

of an opposite character may come forward freely. Of late, our legislation in regard to the canvassing has been maligned; and yet our rules are both simple and liberal." He then proceeds to lay down the law, and winds up by an urgent appeal "to our loyal country labourers and to the intelligent artisans of our cities." One of the most striking passages of this circular is certainly the following: "Fearing," says M. Billault, "that their unbounded confidence in the Government may induce them to abstain from the poll, I trust that the prefects will strongly urge upon the electors the necessity of voting, were it but to drown in an immense manifestation of the people the imperceptible minority of hostile parties." I could produce no better proof of the universal apathy than the above official statements.

The resolution adopted by the Government to recommend the re-election of the whole former Assembly, and consequently to excommunicate, as it were, every other candidate, was approved of by a few, and blamed by many. To be sure, it was an easy and convenient mode of maintaining the *statu quo*; but was it a just measure, or was it conformable to a sound policy, as the Minister had so positively proclaimed it to be in his circular? He had himself admitted that, "either taking advantage of their old and well-approved devotion, or loyally rallying round a dynasty which had done so much for the glory and security of the nation, many men of high standing by their fortune, talents, and due influence, had solicited the honour of becoming official candidates." Then wherefore exclude them systematically? Was not this actually to provoke discontent both among the discarded candidates and among certain groups of population, desirous indeed of supporting the Government, but no less desirous of being seriously consulted as to the choice of their representatives? And again, it was but prudent to remember that, after the elections of 1852—in other words, on the very morrow of a revolution—a large number of such men as are ever ready to support a successful cause, and are ever enthusiastic admirers of sheer force, had managed to be returned by certain departments, whilst men of real influence and popularity in these same provinces had stood aloof, and left free scope to strangers sent purposely from Paris, to canvass for places where their very names were scarcely known. Was it wise and prudent, five years after, to hold forth those self-same people against others of higher importance in every respect? Besides, if a seat in the Chamber became a sort of life-rent in favour of a Government minion, what was to become of so many old families, still associated with the memories and vicissitudes of provincial life—still looked up to

by the population itself as so many ornaments to the country, where their ancient pedigrees or newly-acquired honours had struck deep roots in the parent soil?

There was doubtless some truth in these observations and criticisms, which were, however, expressed *sotto voce*, and with such humility as is incumbent upon those who do not enjoy freedom of speech. True, there might be cogent reasons for excluding certain candidates; but when among the exceptions figured such a man as Montalembert, the impartial looker-on could entertain no other feeling but regret, and even disgust. The new-fangled ostracism came out in the eyes of the public in odious colours when thus applied; for Count de Montalembert is certainly no revolutionist, nor did he pass six years ago for being inimical to the Imperial Government. He had not only bowed his head under the *coup d'état* of 1851, but had even, to a certain extent, welcomed it. His opposition to the decrees levelled against the property of the Orleans family was doubtless strong—some might even say violent,—but it never arrived at being factious. The Legislative body seldom voted with that illustrious orator, but always listened to his impassioned eloquence with respect, and even deference, because no one mistrusted his sincerity. It seems, therefore, very doubtful whether it was consistent with political wisdom on the part of M. Billault to wage open war against such a man, and to supersede him in the national Assembly by one of the Emperor's chamberlains. Such blows do far more injury to their originators than to the enemy they are destined to crush for ever.

It is important for our comprehension of the present crisis in France to dwell upon this retrospective view of the elections of 1857. They are truly and verily the key and clue to those of 1863. The politician studies with no less interest the acorn than the wide-spread oak, that has weathered the storms of a thousand years. The reader must, therefore, bear with me a little longer before I proceed to comment upon passing events.

In countries where the representative system thrives and prospers, a period of general elections is ever accompanied with a certain amount of political agitation. Every party is preparing for the contest: circulars, meetings, addresses are multiplied in every direction. The press, above all, echoes back the din of preparation for the impending battle. The candidates are unassuming, unpretending, ready to answer every query, whether it proceeds from the highest or the lowest in the land. At the time I am speaking of, in France, there was nothing of the kind. The official candidates were so sure of an overwhelming majority, that in most of the electoral

districts they had even no competitor, and the main object of the prefects was to bring up to the poll the electors, who would gladly have abstained from voting, being fully convinced that the Government could dispense with their services. In a few towns alone, such as Bordeaux, Lyons, and Paris, was there anything like animation; and even this was confined within certain very modest limits. As for the newspapers, they showed what we should call "pluck" nowhere but in the metropolis, where old associations and the presence of some men of importance emboldened them to maintain their ground. But even here it was little better than a low murmur:—

—— Parvæ murmura vocis.

After all, it could scarcely have been otherwise, for the old political parties appeared to have given up any share in the government of the country. Each of them, indeed, considered as an individual entity, was by far too weak in numbers, too devoid of influence, to assume the guidance of public opinion. On the other hand, they did not even agree as to their own principles or leading doctrines, so that a coalition—even supposing it to be practicable—could never last. On the eve of the elections, the Opposition of every hue and dye was yet putting the question whether they were to vote or not; and in the midst of such general confusion we can hardly understand how Paris returned *five* Radical members out of ten, which then made up the group of deputies for the French capital.

Such were the Elections of 1857, which gave an almost unanimous Assembly to the Government; but, at the same time, brought home to many a mind the fact, that this overwhelming majority was due to the country electors and rural districts. This fact was so evident, that an important newspaper of the time, the *Assemblée Nationale*, boldly expressed its opinion in the following words: "In the late elections it would be difficult to see one of those free and spontaneous manifestations of public opinion which carry conviction to every impartial mind as to the union of the country with its government. The country parishes have indeed greatly contributed to the general result of the present election; but still we must not lose sight of the pressure of Government, when we compare the opposition and abstention of large towns with the devotedness and adherence of the rural districts."

During the three following years such important events occurred in Italy that the French Legislative Assembly, as well as every other internal incident, was utterly overlooked. The only bearing which that memorable war had upon the actual occurrences and elections in France, was the gradual change

they effected among the Catholic clergy. Since 1849, the latter, headed by their bishops and principal leaders of former times, were accustomed to consider Louis Napoleon as the providential protector and guardian of the Church. On this uncertain and fickle die did they cast their all, giving up with alacrity and single-heartedness every principle of liberty and civic dignity which they had so long contended for with no common valour and success. It was, indeed, a melancholy sight to view the grey-haired and venerable defenders of the Church under Louis Philippe fall one after the other into the courtly snares of Louis Napoleon. The game of old times was played over once more, and with equal success. Donations and endowments were showered on the prelates, and on the *curés*, and downward on the poor indigent *vicaires*; but in the meantime the silken rope was thrown around the neck, the noose grew tighter and tighter, thanks to pettifogging ministers and lawyers, when lo! a clap of thunder pealed throughout the whole world, and the Holy Father himself sounded the trumpet of resistance to the nefarious usurpations of a Cavour, and to the still deeper designs of his Imperial protector in Paris. The year 1856 witnessed the triumph of Cavour's policy at the Congress; 1860 showed a modification in Napoleon's policy in regard to France itself; 1863 shows another turn—another *Wendepunkt*, as the Germans would say, and this decisive step may be partly ascribed to the attitude of the Catholics. The spell is broken, the charmer works no more, and the Church is probably destined either to recover her freedom, or to suffer persecution: in both cases she must be the winner.

We have just seen how thoroughly defenceless was every political party in France against the encroachments and aspiring tendencies of the Imperial Government. It is but just to add that the most distinguished men among the French Catholics were at first hardly better prepared for the impending struggle. Their spirit was worn out, their ardour damped, the fire of their energy quenched. The writer of these lines well remembers a certain day in 1859, when some among their number met at a private house to consult together as to what might be done for the Holy Father in his distress. Priests were there, eminent writers were there, deputies were there, to say nothing of a whole bevy of minor stars. After a full hour's talking, the conference ended in adopting a form of prayer for the Pope, and voting the publication of a small pamphlet intended to defend in a popular form the temporal rights of Pius IX. The meeting was about to separate, when an English Catholic, who happened to be present, ventured to put in a few words to the following purpose:—"You must allow a foreigner," said

he, "were it only on the score of English eccentricity, to make a few remarks on what has just taken place. I cannot help expressing my surprise at the meagre result of our present meeting. A short prayer, and a short pamphlet to be published by subscription—is that really all that the Catholics of Paris can do for their beloved Father? Prayers are inestimable things in their way; but action is likewise of some use. Now, here you are—the same men who fought pertinaciously during twenty years for religious freedom, and nowadays you tell us that under the present constitution nothing can be done! You will excuse my bluntness; but I say that there must be some flaw in this Constitution, into which you may insert the wedge. There are plenty of lawyers and deputies in this room: well, let them consult among themselves and give us a constitutional means of loudly protesting against the Emperor's policy in regard to Rome. It is not for me to point out how the thing is to be done; but surely you can do in Catholic France what I could do to-morrow in Protestant England."

The above simple and plain-spoken words had the singular effect of loosening every man's tongue; it was soon found out that the Senate was empowered to receive and discuss petitions, and consequently a petition was immediately drawn up, and in a few days covered with numberless signatures. The movement, once initiated, spread over all France, and the Catholics had the signal merit of being the very first to revive something like public spirit with respect to an all-important subject.

It would be needless and far from my purpose to describe in detail the agitation which marked the years 1860 and 1861. Every reader well remembers the events of that time. In December, 1859, the Emperor had written a letter to the Pope, in which he declared that the laws of inexorable logic did not allow him to bring back the Romagna to the obedience of the Holy See; and as a last resource referred Pius IX. to a congress. But just as public opinion was rallying round this new idea, a famous pamphlet, "*Le Pape et le Congrès*," burst forth on the astonished world, and all idea of a congress was blown away. And then followed in rapid succession measure after measure on the part of the Emperor, which seemed to lash as it were public opinion into a frenzy. But still the warfare relative to the Roman question took the lead. In the press the contest was kept up on both sides with a degree of vehemence and ability which recalled other times; whilst the bishops, in their pastoral charges, boldly confronted the Government doctrines, both in regard to the temporal power of the Pope and the pseudo-Gallicanism of a Rouland. The latter, though a lawyer, was, indeed, utterly discomfited and

reduced to his wits' end. The press it was an easy matter to silence, and M. Billault made good use of his weapon by suppressing the *Univers* and several other Catholic journals. It was, indeed, remarkable that M. Veuillot, the vehement and talented advocate of arbitrary power, the ardent opponent and crier-down of every free institution, should have been disarmed in a good cause through the very means which he recommended for the repression of others. But these means could not be used against the bishops, who defied them as they defied threats, and flattery, and advice, and supplications of every description. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when, after reading the Papal Encyclical, they turned to the historical dissertations of a Thouvenel, or the compendious demonstrations of a Rouland?

The reader may now begin to perceive the connection between the religious agitation of 1859 and 1860 and the Elections of 1863. The former movement prepared and rendered possible the latter; nay, more, it acted immediately and directly on the French Chambers by encouraging the able defenders of the Papal rights. Both in the Senate and in the Corps Législatif they were emboldened by the support they met with in the world at large. And then it was that a Keller, an Anatole Lemer cier, a Kolb Bernard, and many others, won their golden spurs; then it was that a Montalembert, a Prince de Broglie, a Bishop of Orleans, thundered forth their philippics in defiance of the Imperial policy; then it was, in fine, that on a division ninety-one voters were found to have given their voice against two words of the address which implied a slur on the conduct of the Holy Father. Those ninety-one members were doomed, and henceforward considered as mortal enemies of the throne; but they had made an impression on the country, and their protest was the very first lisping of Liberty endeavouring once more to recover her former accents with her former power. The French Catholics may ever be proud of having been the first to resist an autocrat whose omnipotence had hitherto met with no opposition, even from the staunchest adherents of democracy. It is now high time that we should turn our immediate attention to the elections of 1863, which will probably mark a new era in the new-fashioned parliamentary history of France.

We should certainly attribute no more than his due to Napoleon III. in believing that his keen eye had read an important lesson in the attitude of the Catholics during the two preceding years. At the rise of his erratic star above the political horizon they had been the very first to support his views and

plans, as far as they could know them. Headed by their clergy and principal leaders, they had steadily adhered to his fortunes, in 1849, 1851, and 1852. There are still people in France who remember seeing Count de Montalembert walking arm in arm with Prince Louis Napoleon; and there are others who recollect how strongly that eminent orator and his friends recommended to the votes of the Catholics their imperial *protégé*. Well, for eight long years these single-hearted bishops and simple-minded lay Catholics had persevered in the same policy, ever supporting a Government which openly professed to protect and favour religion.

All of a sudden these faithful adherents and conservative partisans drop the connection, passing successively and in a short time, from coolness and distrust to an open opposition, the effects of which are soon felt in every direction. In the press, in the House of Assembly, in the Senate, nay, even within the sanctuary, they fearlessly confront Napoleon's sovereign power. They were not to be bribed, not to be baffled by wiles, not to be daunted,—above all, not to be persecuted. Well might the Imperial mind ponder over a situation so new to him. But with that remarkable swiftness of determination, that seems to be a peculiar gift of this extraordinary man, he resolved at once to alter his line of policy. He saw—perhaps with regret—that France was no longer to be held in leading-strings. Consequently a series of measures, all more or less tending to inaugurate a freer system, were successively adopted. Thus, the Assembly was called upon to deliberate with open doors, and to vote an address to the Crown; to its great surprise, the Senate was told that it had other things to do than to repeat a perpetual *Nay*, whilst the Corps Législatif received a well-timed hint that it might sometimes vary its no less perpetual *Ayes* to every Government bill, by a spice of debate or even of modest opposition. Then came also the adoption of free-trade principles, coupled with these singular words, dropped by the Emperor himself: “My Government stands in need of publicity and control.” Accordingly, an extraordinary degree of freedom was granted to the revolutionary press against the Pope; but the favours of warnings and suspensions and suppressions were still awarded—as was due indeed—to the Catholic journals. As a last measure of this kind we may mention the appointment of M. de Persigny as Minister of the Home Department. The general elections were approaching, and in the present state of affairs an unflinching tool of the Imperial will was indispensable. M. de Persigny acted as the ballast destined to steady the ship through the seething waves.

And yet the new Minister was ushered in as a harbinger of peace and freedom. Every reader will remember his first circular, in which he invited the French people to study and imitate the free institutions of Old England. Had he not himself just returned from that country, and did he not entertain the highest regard for its sound good sense, for its free Parliament and free press? Freedom! freedom! Many a bird in the French press was caught by the glue, lured by the magic of that name, and found too late that the Ministerial circulars were but a snare. Confiscation followed upon confiscation; and then came the mad measures against the Society of S. Vincent de Paul, which have contributed perhaps more than anything else to alienate Catholic hearts and votes from the Imperial Government.

But probably, according to a previous agreement between the master and his devoted servant, and whilst M. Fould was holding forth with his famous financial report, the Minister of the Interior was already busy with the future elections. As a first step, the prefects and sub-prefects were given to understand that their future promotion would depend solely upon their success in canvassing for the official candidates. On the other hand, should they succumb to an Opposition member, immediate dismissal would be the consequence. In a country like France, where a public servant has often no other pecuniary resource but Ministerial favour, such a threat acted as an incessant stimulus on the zeal of the Government agents. Above all, twenty-five deputies, who had been more or less conspicuous for their opposition on the Roman question, were placed under interdict. On no account whatsoever were they to be returned, as they must be decidedly ranked among the foremost enemies of the Imperial dynasty. Again, such men as Thiers, Montalembert, Berryer, De Falloux, Anatole Lemercier, Keller, D'Andelarre, Plichon, &c., were denounced by the Minister as hardly better than so many Catilines, who were plotting the overthrow of social order. Thus spurred on, the prefects set lustily to work. In one province, celebrated for its Napoleonic tendencies, a son of Casimir Périer, well known as an independent character, and M. de Mortemart, belonging to one of the oldest French families, stood for the deputation. A young and ambitious sub-prefect was selected to prevent *per fas et nefas* the election of the latter gentleman. For a whole year he laboured with all his might against the Opposition candidate, when, lo! the versatile Minister changed his mind, and telegraphed to his obedient agent that he must give up his opposition to M. de Mortemart. "No," replied this time the sub-prefect; "I must go on, for I should be dishonoured,

and of no use to you into the bargain." And he *did* go on, and M. de Persigny was obliged to yield to his subaltern; and, after all, M. de Mortemart lost his seat in Parliament; and most probably both Minister and agent chuckled at the thought of their sagacity. Was not M. de Mortemart among the NINETY-ONE?

But in the mean time two singular occurrences had happened, which are of sufficient importance to be taken into account. Towards the latter end of 1861, a new journal had been established under the name of *La France*, edited by the notorious De la Guéronnière. Its founders were all more or less religious men, and all to a man professed the most ardent devotion to the Imperial dynasty. Their object was to defend, in a certain degree, the Holy Father, and to advocate liberal principles in regard to government. They were opposed to M. Thouvenel's policy towards Rome, and bitterly hostile to M. de Persigny's management of the internal affairs. To overthrow the latter seems to have been their prime aim; to replace the former, one of their chief designs. Well, M. Drouyn de Lhuys, honourably known for his attachment to the Holy See, has actually superseded M. de Thouvenel, and M. Boudet has just walked into the hotel of his wayward predecessor:—

—— Faith, 'twas strange, passing strange,

that such such things should come to pass. The why and the wherefore fully deserve a few moments of our attention.

It was impossible that the growing discontent of the French Catholics and bishops should escape the Emperor's penetration. He had but to look around him among some of his most devoted adherents, and even within his own family circle, to discover that brooding feeling of opposition, sometimes the more dangerous and desperate for having to contend with rival sentiments and affections. It became equally evident that the events of the two or three last years tended to throw all these sundry elements of strife into the hands of such parties as are decidedly hostile to the present form of government. I allude, of course, to the Legitimists and Orleanists. Many of them already banded together with the great mass of Catholic opinion, to avail themselves of the opportunity, and form one compact party, under the standard of religion and liberty. A newspaper had been started for that especial purpose: its fidelity had, indeed, been tried by gold, but every one of its contributors had spurned the proffered bribe; and if an independent opponent had been silenced, still the attempted seduction had proved a failure.

Nevertheless, another attempt might be made, and perhaps with unparalleled success. Why not nip the blossom in its bud? Why not establish a journal of the same kind,—a journal assuming airs of complete independence, though secretly dependent upon the master's good will and sufferance? Supposing matters to come to the worst, it would be sowing division among the Catholics, many of whom are anything but Legitimists and Orleanists. And if they rallied round the motley group who sued for permission to publish *La France*, might they not be led on a little farther, and by degrees be weaned from their close and faithful adherence to their spiritual pastors of high or low degree? Nay more, might not some bishops be themselves won over to the spangled flag of Imperial religionism, if I may be allowed the term? Such an object was worth a trial.

And so the plan was carried into execution; and M. de la Guéronnière was placed at the head of the new publication, which was brought forth to the world, dressed up in the gold-laced swaddling-clothes of half a dozen senators. But the appointment of such a man as the writer who prided himself on the paternity of "*Le Pape et le Congrès*," which alone rendered a congress downright impossible, was in itself a blunder. M. de la Guéronnière is a man who can mould himself into every shape and form as a journalist or as a pamphleteer; ay, who can convert himself into anything, except a deep thinker or a consistent politician. He began by editing a provincial newspaper patronized by the Legitimist party; then skipped over to the *Presse*, under Emile de Girardin; then turned Republican with Lamartine; then again fenced, and parried, and fought for Louis Napoleon, who finally rewarded his chameleon-like abilities by a seat in the Senate. At Athens he would have ranked among the Sophists, who bore such bitter enmity to Socrates; in Rome he might have taught Cæsar and Cicero the art of writing; but above all he would have clung to Cæsar. His silvery tones and polished periods charm the ear; but when you come to probe the sense beneath, alas! you scarcely find anything else but—

——— Sesquipedalia verba.

To select such a man, therefore, as the leading spirit of the new undertaking, was, I repeat it, an egregious blunder. In fact, whenever M. de la Guéronnière endeavoured to lay down his principles and to state his doctrines, there was a vagueness in his articles which was felt by every reader. He only became pungent, terse, and thoroughly spirited whenever he had to

oppose, under covert terms, M. de Persigny. Indeed, his journal soon became a daily exponent of bitter hostility to the Minister, who more than once deigned to reply with his own hand in the *Constitutionnel*. Thus the quarrel became a drawn battle between M. de Persigny and M. de la Guéronnière, to the infinite amusement of the gallery, and, perhaps, of the Emperor himself.

On the whole, however, *La France* had the better of its powerful antagonist. For some secret reason unknown to the public, the journal was allowed to go to the full length of its tether, and it lost no opportunity in making the most of this advantage. The forthcoming elections were a fair ground for a hand-to-hand fight; so M. de la Guéronnière plunged headlong in *medias res*. When the semi-official organs of the Home Department treated as enemies the Opposition candidates, and reprobated in the strongest terms their election, *La France* maintained with no less energy that their opposition would become insignificant when confronted with an overwhelming majority. Besides, would not these malcontents be far more dangerous outside the Chamber than within its walls? What was the use, as the Minister had done formerly—what was the use of appealing to the generosity and best feelings of old parties, if their most eminent representatives were to be branded as outlaws and deadly foes, because they believed in the professions of the Government? Again, if such members as those who had showed a feeling of independence on the Roman question were to be held up to public execration, was not this going directly in the teeth of the Imperial declaration, that a control or a safety-valve was indispensable? Was this wisdom? Was it acting up to the express wishes of the Sovereign, who, above all, courted publicity and an honest appreciation of his measures? Was it a system of policy adapted to conciliate opposition or to propitiate enmity? As it was natural to infer from the above reasoning, *La France* ended by supporting the very men whom M. de Persigny publicly reprobated.

But this personal controversy, together with other influences of a still more important nature, operated likewise in a way which was totally unexpected by any party, and took every one by surprise. The Emperor had so often spoken of England; so often held up her institutions as a sort of model for the French people; so often talked in public, as well as in private, of the abuses of centralization; so often manifested the wish to see the policy of his Government subjected to a control, that he was at length taken at his word. Strange it was, but yet there was no denying the fact, that the lower no less than the

upper classes began to speak seriously of crowning the edifice. We are here brought to consider one of the most singular and curious features of French character, or rather of the French world, as it has been moulded and kneaded into shape by the present Government.

During the Italian war, as was noticed above, the revolutionary and infidel journals were allowed full scope to assail and malign the Catholics and their venerable Chief. All the severity of the Home Department, then governed in regard to the press by M. de la Guéronnière, was directed against religious newspapers. Three journals, the *Siècle*, the *Opinion Nationale*, and the *Presse*, were conspicuous for their bitter though vulgar hostility to the Holy See. The two former were well known to be pseudo-democrats, having one foot in the Imperial and another in the Republican camp. They all three bent their knee before Mammon, and catered to the popular prepossessions. In reality, however, they belonged, as far as they clung to any principle, to the Republican school, and consequently did their best to form a coalition to be used to some purpose in the future elections. Their readers were taught day by day to give up their own individual opinions for the sake of the common weal; the *Siècle* boasted more than once of its multitudinous public, whose name was million; well, this million was made to consider M. Havin, the chief editor of the journal, as the true representative of Democracy, notwithstanding his well-known intimacy with certain Ministers. The same with M. Guérault, of the *Opinion Nationale*; the same with the *Presse*, now edited by the notorious Emile de Girardin. At first sight, the combination of these newspapers to direct and weigh upon the elections seems absolutely ridiculous; and so it would be in England; but "they order these matters better in France," and so we must take them into serious account. The licence which the Imperial Government had given these three journals really constituted a monopoly in their favour. They used it to secure the election of such candidates—in Paris, at least—as they deemed disposed to promote their designs. The working-classes were disciplined and pledged to follow up certain directions; but of the nine Parisian members, four were already known as staunch Republicans, and had done good service during the sessions included between 1857 and 1863. They were, of course, to be supported, but on condition of admitting as candidates a Havin and a Guérault, whom at the bottom of their own hearts they despised and scorned. A sad alternative, indeed; but there was no avoiding the dilemma, and so the infamous bargain was both struck and carried into execution. I can vouch for the above fact, for I had it

from one of the parties who owed his election to the conspiracy, and who considers himself as "an honest man for a' that, and for a' that!" We may well understand the scruples of a Thiers when he was obliged to bend his neck to such a yoke. It is likewise hardly possible to imagine that the Imperial Government should have foreseen such a result when it carried favour with the revolutionist party, at the expense of every Conservative feeling and opinion in France; but—

Eumenidum veluti demens videt agmina Pentheus.

On the other hand, there is in the country a long-standing party, which has never abjured its love of freedom—never catered for popularity—never given up its heartfelt, sincere, deep adherence to religious principles and practices. The main body of this party belongs to the *bourgeoisie*, and is distinguished by those domestic and civic virtues which adorn alike the private house and the public rostrum; they it is who surround the pulpit of Notre Dame; they it is who man the ranks of the Vincentian brotherhood; they it is who fill the Government offices; they it is who instil a Christian spirit into the labouring classes. These men, young and old, are generally no friends to the revolutionists; but they are no more friends to arbitrary power and despotism. The only charge which, perhaps, might be brought against them is a certain degree of apathy and indifference in regard to their duties as citizens, being rather too prone to leave to Providence the reformation of mankind and the punishment of crime. "Hell will never prevail over the Church—*ergo*, we may wash our hands of what is going on"—such seems to be their motto. "As long as we can go to confession and communion, and visit the poor, all is for the best." Such sort of people we might imagine the *boni homines* and the *equites Romani* to have been in the time of old Cicero.

And yet these were the men who were suddenly appealed to as forming the reserve and prop of liberty. For many long years they had held aloof, hardly hoping for a future, still less expecting that they might have a share in that future. At first they hesitated and haggled for conditions, and then decided only at the very last moment. As a specimen of this class, I may name M. Dufaure, one of the most highly-respected men in France, and who lost his election at Bordeaux merely from the fact that he did not begin canvassing until the Government had taken every measure to secure victory to their own *protégé*. It is to be hoped that the French Liberal-Conservatives will, in future, profit by the lesson.

Such was the situation when the French Chambers were dis-

solved in the beginning of May, and an Imperial decree ushered in the general elections for the 31st of May and 1st of June, 1863. I have noted above the measures adopted by M. de Persigny as preparatory to that important act; I must now relate the principal episodes of the battle itself, and bring out, as well as I can, the results of these elections, especially in their bearings on the prospects of the Catholic Church.

In order that the reader may fully understand what follows, I shall first of all lay before him the chief legal details of a French election. The writ is issued twenty days before the poll, and during the intervals the candidates are at liberty to send round their circulars, publish their "professions of faith" in the local newspapers—do all but meet their constituents. Singular though it may appear to an Englishman, a stringent law does not allow in France any meeting for a political purpose of more than twenty persons; and even that must be held in private. At the very beginning of the late electoral agitation this law was practically enforced by the Government.

But bad as this system is, it might work well were its enactments made to operate with fairness and impartiality. Unfortunately it is quite the reverse. The Administration puts forth its whole strength, and employs its numerous army of agents, in favour of its own candidate and against his opponent. The prefect, the sub-prefect, the mayors, the tax collectors, the customs' officers, the village schoolmasters, down to the very policemen, are all canvassing for one particular individual. His circulars are often printed and sent round at the expense of Government, who bestows upon them the privilege of being freed from the stamp duties; the prefects travel through every city, market-town, and village of any importance, to hold forth on the exceptional merits of the Government *protégé*. M. le Préfet not only hints, but even proclaims openly, that the "Emperor's candidate," and he alone, in case of being elected, will obtain ministerial money for the repair of churches, a branch railway for the furtherance of industry, a new parish road to the next market-town, &c. Walpole himself is beaten in the art of manoeuvring, and might have held down his head for very shame.

Now even this extraordinary way of proceeding might become tolerable, were the independent canvasser to enjoy the same advantages. But, on the contrary, the Government agents must all to a man become his enemies on pain of dismissal; the post-office alone (and heaven knows how it can be trusted) will take charge of his circulars, unless he prefers the very expensive mode of sending them through private messengers. Then, again, his handbills are often torn down by official emis-

saries, or he can find no printer who dares to print them ! Lately, in one of the southern departments, a candidate was obliged to stick up his own addresses ; and I am sorry to add that in the Côtes-du-Nord a venerable bishop, strongly opposed to M. de Montalembert, and following in the footsteps of Government, deprived the diocesan printer of his lordship's custom, because the unfortunate man had unwittingly ventured to publish that gentleman's circulars.

When we consider the great difficulties against which the Opposition candidate has to contend, we must feel surprised that any of them should succeed at all, rather than be astonished at the small number of those who have obtained a seat in the new Corps Législatif. Indeed, there is another and most important obstacle which we must take into account. On comparing the total number of electors who for the last ten years have been registered with those who have voted, we come to the astounding conclusion that one-fourth, and in many cases one-third, of them, have acted upon the principle of abstention. Now these abstainers, as we may call them, are numerous everywhere, and in some electoral districts may even be counted by tens of thousands ! Had these good people, most of them practical Catholics, fulfilled their duty, the balance might have been turned in favour of their opinions, and the Government obliged to adopt a different line of policy in regard to Rome. Would not such a line of conduct have proved at least quite as useful to the Holy See as to contribute faithfully to the collection of Peter's pence ?

The pleas put forward to justify this singular apathy are twofold. Many declare that it would be absolutely impossible to withstand the undue pressure of the Government on the elections ; consequently, it is far better to stand still and do nothing than to produce public proofs of one's weakness and helplessness. The noble circular of seven bishops has victoriously replied to this defence ; though it is to be feared that no eloquence—were it even that of a Bossuet or a Demosthenes—will ever rouse men who are resolved to turn a deaf ear to every remonstrance.

It is easier to understand the argument brought forward by the second class of systematic non-voters. They are all Legitimists, who pretend to obey the orders of their Sovereign, Henry V. They must have nothing to do with the Empire, or its institutions. To vote for a candidate would be virtually to acknowledge the legitimacy of the present system ; and that, of course, they cannot and never will do. Unfortunately for their argument, it is well known that the Comte de Chambord leaves his adherents at liberty to vote whenever

they deem it necessary for the interests of religion or of the country. It may well be asked also what will become of the party itself, if the Legitimists thus continue to stand aloof, and persevere in this policy of non-intervention in the internal affairs of their own fatherland. As a party, they will fast dwindle into nothingness, and become objects of universal contempt.

But it is now time to adduce some proofs of the extraordinary pressure which M. de Persigny brought to bear upon the late elections. My sources of information are both of a public and private character; but out of a large bundle of such documents I will confine myself to the principal—they will suffice for my purpose, and it will be no fault of mine if some of them provoke indignation, others perhaps a smile, on the part of an English reader.

I will begin with M. de Montalembert, who stood for his own department, and also for the Côtes-du-Nord, where a large number of influential Catholics had offered him their votes. I cannot refrain from quoting a part of his address to the electors; it gives us the measure of the man:—

You and I are old acquaintances. In the critical days of 1848, for the first time, you practised universal suffrage by calling on me to represent you. In 1849 and 1852 you again renewed our connection. You were then most rightly concerned at the perils to which social order was exposed. That order I defended according to the best of my abilities, though I never overlooked the imperious claims of the future, and of freedom. At present, it is in the name of that long absent freedom that I solicit your suffrage.

Do you wish that the Government to which you have delegated your sovereignty should enjoy an absolute omnipotence, unbounded, unfettered by any real responsibility?—No. Do you wish that Government to obtain, among your representatives, as well as among your own selves, an efficacious support in every measure tending to the glory and prosperity of France?—You do. But do you likewise wish it to be seriously controlled, criticised, and even contradicted, when it may be necessary?—You do. Well, then, if such be the case, return a member entirely independent of the Government; and if you can find no better man, return me.

I gave many a pledge under Royalty, the Republic, and the Empire. Nobody can say that I was a systematic opponent of any Government. But neither was I ever a courtier, nor a blind and dumb servant of any master.

I am still what I ever was—a Catholic and a Liberal.

I will defend Religion, but by such means as are compatible with the spirit of modern times and the liberty of all.

I wish to reconquer Freedom, but with such weapons as are conformable to justice, morality, and honour.

The Count concludes in the following manly words:—

But I have said quite enough. We know each other. You know well enough that if you return me I shall do my duty.

If you do not return me, you will cause me neither harm nor pain.

If you return me, you will give me an unmistakable proof that you are still faithful to the old and manly *franchise* of the Comtois ; and by so doing you will do no less credit to yourselves than to me.

It would seem that the best policy on the part of the Administration would have been not to oppose, but rather to favour, the re-election of a man of European celebrity, and who, in spite of what some may characterize as his occasional intemperance of language, has given unquestionable proof of sincerity, single-heartedness, and hatred of revolutionary principles. Of the latter, his address alone was a sufficient evidence. M. de Persigny, however, was of a different opinion, and his agents studiously represented M. de Montalembert as a personal enemy of the Emperor—a wild revolutionist, who speculated on the overthrow of every principle sacred in the eyes of mankind. How to reconcile these accusations either with his own character and station, or with the support given him by the whole clergy of the diocese, headed by their venerable archbishop, is somewhat difficult to understand ; but so it was, and the result proved that M. de Persigny had rightly trusted to the weakness of the *bourgeois*, and to the blind prejudices of the peasantry. The latter, indeed, were plied with an argument which appealed more directly to their material interests. The mountaineers of the Jura are celebrated for the products of their dairies, and large quantities of cheese are yearly exported from this province to different parts of the world. The reader will hardly believe that the following placard was posted up in Besançon and its immediate neighbourhood on the very day before the poll :—

ELECTORS,—If you vote for M. de Montalembert you will vote for :—

The ignorance of your children ;
 The feudal *régime*, and all its abuses ;
 War in Italy ;
 Salt at five sous a pound ;
 Cheese at thirty francs the hundredweight ;
 Lastly, you will vote for an enemy of the Government.

(Signed) A FEW FRIENDS OF THE RURAL POPULATION.

The above document speaks volumes ; but to appreciate it duly we must bear in mind that the friends of M. de Montalembert had not, any more than those of any other candidate, the means of counteracting its effects. No provincial paper would venture to fix its authorship on the Administration, as suspension, or even suppression, might be the consequence. Besides, a flat denial of the fact is a convenient resource, to which it is impossible to reply. In the present case these mean artifices

appear to have told upon the rural electors, for the Count was not returned.

Between the Vosges mountains and the Rhine lies a small province, celebrated for the intelligence and industry of its inhabitants. The Alsatians are likewise well known for their attachment to the Imperial dynasty. They have often suffered, as well as neighbouring Lorraine, from foreign invasion, and cling with fondness to the memory of the man who carried the French eagles victorious through all Europe. In the late Legislature, M. Keller stood for Colmar; and as he had loyally sworn allegiance to the present Government, many people expected that he would again be returned, notwithstanding his honest opposition to particular measures. Such, however, was not the opinion of M. de Persigny, who singled him out as an object of bitter enmity. Had not M. Keller, on several occasions, showed himself independent of any other consideration but conscience? *Indè iræ.*

The person adopted by the Home Department as the official candidate, was formerly a prefect in an important city of southern France. There he distinguished himself by such flagrant acts of immorality, that the whole town was soon in an uproar, and the delinquent was most properly dismissed by Government. From that time down to the present day, the ex-prefect had settled in prudent obscurity on his estates in Alsace; when, all of a sudden, M. de Persigny wrote him a letter, in which he besought M. W—— to stand for the deputation in opposition to M. Keller! This Ministerial epistle was neatly copied out, and circulated by the prefect of Colmar, until it found its way into the columns of the newspapers, having been sent by M. Keller himself. This gentleman is treated by M. de Persigny as a wild fanatic, as an enemy to the Imperial institutions; above all, as a revolutionist, for this qualification seems to form the climax of Government denunciation. In my humble opinion, this system of browbeating is the shortest way to turn every honest man into a revolutionist; and woe to those Governments under whose rule such things come to pass!

If we turn from the east to the west, or to the north and south of France, we still meet with the same vexatious story of agents running about in every direction to counteract the influence of M. Lemercier, for instance, at La Rochelle, who is likewise proclaimed a Red Republican. There must be some truth in this, for was he not a member of the Council-General of the Vincentian brotherhood—that bugbear of M. de Persigny? Again, at Fougères, in Brittany, we have another reading of the famous cheese conspiracy of M. de

Montalembert; for as old Armorica is renowned for its large trade in excellent butter, the country electors are told with all the gravity becoming in officers of his Imperial Majesty, that by electing the Opposition candidate, M. de Kerdrel, they would vote the underselling of butter by so many sous a pound; and, surely enough, M. de Kerdrel lost the battle.

The crowning piece, however, of this electoral strategy on the part of the Minister has yet to come, and I am able to relate the two following incidents on the best authority. Poitiers is the seat of a Court of Appeal, and one of its members determined to stand forth as an independent candidate. As sitting on the bench, he was evidently no enemy to the ruling Government, on whom he is dependent for promotion. His only crime was that he did not advocate the system of official nominees. He was soon summoned by the Minister of Justice, M. Delangle, to give up all pretension to the deputation; and, on his refusal, his court was actually called upon to meet, and to declare that their brother judge had proved himself unworthy of the bench! The court, on assembling, naturally scouted the idea, and replied, *nem. con.*, that it was perfectly monstrous to maintain that a man committed a misdemeanour by canvassing for a seat in the Assembly.

The second incident is of a still more serious character. At Libourne, not far from Bordeaux, M. Decazes, a son of the celebrated Minister, and who has conferred numberless benefits on the south-west of France, had resolved to stand for the above city. One of his friends, enjoying great influence with the population, had volunteered to attend in person at the forthcoming election, and to use his great popularity in favour of M. Decazes. But early on the morning of May 31st this gentleman was suddenly put under arrest, and transferred to Bordeaux, where he was brought before the Procureur Impérial, on some trifling charge. M. Decazes having been informed of the fact, went at once to the Solicitor-General, and threatened a public prosecution if his friend was not immediately liberated. The release took place; but on the very next day the unfortunate gentleman was again apprehended, again brought before the officer of the Crown, and again released in the evening, with many apologies. In the mean time the poll had closed, and four or five thousand voters for M. Decazes had stayed at home, for fear of incurring the same persecution. Of course these proceedings will give rise to a protest; the election itself will probably be annulled;—but what are we to think of universal suffrage itself, when it allows such glaring acts of barefaced injustice? And if they had taken

place in Naples, what an outcry would have at once burst forth from the French and English press !

I must now bring this long paper to a close. The reader who has followed me so far has a right to inquire what I conceive will be the result of the French Elections of 1863. What will be their practical effect on the Government and the nation? What have we to expect, for evil or for good, from this pitched battle on the electoral ground? What, again, for the immediate future of the Papacy, that all-absorbing interest of every good Catholic? To answer these questions is rather a difficult problem; but still, we are in possession of certain leading facts, which may serve as a clue to guide us through the labyrinth of Napoleon's policy.

For the last four or five years France has been taught to believe and repeat that, under the Imperial Government, she was the grand deliverer of enslaved nations. Within the folds of her glorious banner were hidden the freedom and independence of the world. A good cause, with justice and humanity for its support, was sufficient to call her legions to the farthest ends of the earth. Such was the principle laid down by the Emperor himself in one of his most telling speeches; such the watchword echoed by a thousand Ministerial journals, and repeated by the humblest cottier in the empire. We have not here to investigate how far, or in what manner, this grand sentiment has been carried into execution; our duty is merely to mark its effects upon the French people. With their usual intelligence and vigorous power of logic, they soon began to put the following awkward questions:—

“Why should Italy enjoy a free government and free institutions, whilst we are fettered and bound by a despotic form of government, though tolerably mild in its practical application? Are we below the Italians, whom we have helped to recover their independence?”

“Again, are we below the Austrians, whom we have so signally defeated and humbled to the dust? They are already retrieving their losses—recovering from their state of permanent bankruptcy, controlling their Government through a free parliament, a free constitution, a free press, which your official and semi-official newspapers are constantly lauding—are we unworthy of the same boon? Why not at length try the same method with ourselves?”

“Do we rank below the Anglo-Saxons, below the Americans, below the Prussians, below the Bavarians? Are we less civilized than they? less intelligent? less Christian?”

“Why confine your reforms to free trade, or to a certain

freedom of speech granted to our deputies and senators? These are all very well as the first instalments of liberty; but is it not high time to go farther, to add the crowning piece to your constitution, as you so formally promised when you ascended the throne? Your power is boundless, your enemies are prostrate, your Government the strongest in the world. Then what are you waiting for? Above all, why persist in a system of official candidates, who in reality are mock representatives of a mock parliament, and whose mode of election is a slur cast upon the national honour and dignity?"

Such are the questions which, of late, have been constantly discussed among the middle class throughout all France; sometimes in the form of inaudible murmurs, like the moanings of the rising wind; at others breaking forth in bolder tones, which the warnings of the Home Department could scarcely for a moment repress. The late elections, in particular, have spoken in no mistakable language the signs of the times; for it is a striking fact that in most of the French towns and cities the Opposition candidates would have won the victory, had it not been for the rural voters of the surrounding district, who had been purposely massed up with the city population, in order to secure the return of the Government *protégés*.

Doubtless the wild and insane policy of De Persigny in his late electoral campaign has done much to produce this result; but those who are not content to consider merely the surface of things, and who endeavour to catch at least a glimpse of undercurrents, will bear me out in my opinion that France is undergoing a social transformation, totally independent of any particular statesman or any political party. The French, with their ready wit, have nicknamed Persigny a Persignac, to signify his resemblance with Prince de Polignac; but were there no Persignac, the situation would just be the same. Men grow weary of being kept in leading-strings when they feel that they have strength, not only to walk, but to run alone.

Now, Napoleon is certainly the last man to misunderstand these evident manifestations of public opinion. His keen eye is watchful of every event, his sensitive ear alive to every sound arising out of the bosom of the nation, which for the last ten years he has been leading on to become the umpire of Europe. He has already given pledges of his disposition to yield with good grace what he cannot withhold much longer; and thus I believe that I am justified in affirming that ere long France will obtain a larger share of real constitutional government. We have probably seen the last of official nominees; and the appointment of new Ministers, who are in no way statesmen or politicians, may perhaps be accepted as the harbinger of more

important reforms. The intention of effecting such reforms may indeed be denied at present ; but was not the appropriation of Savoy and Nice most emphatically denied at the very time when Napoleon and Cavour were drawing up together the secret compact at Plombières ?

Such is my first conclusion. The second, grounded on the first, is no less important, though I am not aware that attention has been drawn to it either in France or England. The generation which was yet at school in 1848 has risen to manhood, and is full of all the yearnings and aspirations of youth. The men of this generation have a longing for liberty, but for a liberty *sui generis*, and perhaps very different, as to its outward forms and trappings, from that ideal which their fathers worshipped. In their eyes a free constitution, coupled with an Imperial Government, and even grafted upon a somewhat despotic system of centralization, is by no means an impossibility. "We wish for liberty," says many a well-meaning Frenchman, "but we require a strong hand to rule and curb us." At any rate, there is a multitude of young men who, though they style themselves Liberals, are now striving to have a share in the management of public affairs, and consequently to take the place of those who now fill the Government offices. Now, the latter do not seem aware of this fact ; they admit of no other social or political status but that to which they have become accustomed, and which they have learned fondly to associate with their past labours and triumphs. On conversing with certain eminent statesmen of those times, one is frequently reminded of the lines in which Horace represents old age as

Difficilis, querulus, laudator temporis acti
Se puero, censor castigatore minorum.

It would certainly be better for France if the young and the old were to combine the well-earned experience of the one with the hot-blooded fervour of the other, for the good of their common country. But come what may, every close observer may already see the elements of an intelligent, active, high-principled party, which may become either his Majesty's Opposition, or his Majesty's Government, or perhaps each by turns. I am well pleased to be able to add, that many a good Catholic is to be found in their ranks.

And this brings us at once to the actual situation of the Church in France, and to the influence which the Elections of 1863 may have on the policy of the Imperial Government in regard to the Holy See. If any one thing took people by surprise, it was the pastoral charge of seven Bishops, all belonging, it was said, to different political opinions, and yet

all united in urging upon the French Catholics not to swerve from their duty as electors. It was an unheard-of incident, and, as such, hailed as a godsend by the many, or condemned as the token of a factious spirit by the few hangers-on of De Persigny's administration. For those who, like myself, are calm spectators of the scenes, the act is simply a proof of the change which has been gradually effected in the minds of the French clergy. But a very short time ago they were upbraided with clinging servilely to the Imperial favour, on condition of receiving in return showers of material benefits, in the form of money for their churches, donations for their charities, or seats in the Senate for their Cardinals and Archbishops. The glorious protestation of the French prelates and priests at Rome, in June, 1862, has disposed of these idle assumptions, and the late manifesto of the seven Bishops has furnished another proof of their energy and disinterestedness wherever they feel religion is concerned. It was a mortal blow dealt against Erastianism in every form. Many a battle may yet be fought, but the issue is evident. The French clergy are awakening to the importance of taking their stand on the firm ground of Liberty. Henceforward both they and their flocks will adhere more and more to the leading principles of free institutions, and press upon the Government the necessity of abandoning the arbitrary practice of the old *régime*, as well as the still more despotic tendencies of the half-infidel bureaucracy of the present age.

But if such is the case, it stands to reason that the Pope in Rome may rely upon a body of defenders in France, which has not its equal throughout the world. Outside the Chambers, and within the Chambers—among the laity, and among the priests—in the press, and outside of the press—will be gradually formed a party steadfastly and consistently supporting the Holy See, and forcing the Government itself to come to terms, should it ever forget its own real interests, and carry into execution the wild plans of the revolutionary party. If the Elections of 1863 produce no other but this single result, still they might be ranked among the most fortunate events of this year, in spite of all their failures and shortcomings.

A few words more, and I have done. Hitherto the ballot and universal suffrage have been used in France exclusively in the cause of anarchy or despotism. In the hands of both, it is certainly a most powerful engine, and people begin to be alarmed at the results it may bring about. By a strong and unscrupulous Government the result of the elections may be made to depend on the most ignorant and fanatic part of the population, who return invariably such men as are agreeable to the Administration. Under such a system, principle,

conscience, and honour are utterly out of the question ; in time, indeed, we might see millions of electors returning men selected for their servility and their readiness to vote according to their own private interest.

On the other hand, the influence of secret societies and revolutionary doctrines is well nigh paramount among the working classes of the towns and cities. During the late elections in Paris, the agents of these societies are known to have utterly changed the dispositions of 2000 workmen in one single night, and made them vote for M. Guérault, the Revolutionist, although they had promised their support to a Conservative. Such combinations and coalitions are certainly alarming for the social fabric ; they constitute a mobocracy, which might easily lord it over the most intelligent and most moral part of the nation. As to a representation of interests and classes, there would be none ; the very possibility of such a state of things is in itself a danger. There is nothing, therefore, astonishing in the fact, that many thinking minds are even now endeavouring to discover some remedy by which universal suffrage might be regulated so as to counteract this twofold peril of despotism and anarchy, inseparable from the electoral system in its present form. The problem is doubtless well worth the meditations of a statesman ; and the very fact of its existence deserved at least to be noticed in an article on the French Elections of 1863.

Δ.

Notices of Books.

Juris Ecclesiastici Publici Institutiones. Auctore CAROLO TARQUINI, S. J.,
Juris Canonici Professore in Collegio Romano ejusdem Societatis.

THIS work did not come to hand till we had sent to press the third article of our present number, or it would have received prominent notice therein. In that article we maintained that, so far from the promotion of spiritual good being external to the civil ruler's province, on the contrary, he acts more laudably in proportion as he more effectively directs his temporal administration to its attainment. We added, however, that (unless he be in invincible ignorance of the Church's divine appointment) he is bound, in all his efforts for spiritual good, to conduct himself with constant subordination and submission to her supreme authority. The following extract (which is but part of a long passage to the same effect) will show how earnestly Father Tarquini maintains the same doctrine; and we have particular pleasure in adducing such high Roman sanction for our statement :—

“ . . . So S. Gregory to the Emperor Maurice. ‘ For this end has power over all men been given from Heaven to our pious princes (*dominorum nostrorum pietati*), that they who seek good things may be assisted; that the way of Heaven may be more widely opened; that the *earthly kingdom may be subject (famuletur) to the heavenly.*’ The same thing is said by Pope Celestine, by S. Isidore of Pelusium, by Ferrandus, and S. Bernard. Wherefore the scholastic doctors have taught that *the chief end of civil government* consists in this, that man may be trained to virtue, and thus to the obedience of religion. Among which doctors it may suffice to mention the author ‘ *De Regimine Principum*,’ where he says—‘ But the end at which the king should *principally aim*, in himself and in his subjects, is *eternal beatitude, which consists in the vision of God.*’

“ The second part [of my statement] is thus proved: viz., that princes ought in such sense to protect religion, as not to anticipate (*antevertant*) but to follow the judgments of the Church; nay and not to exceed the measure, which the Church herself may have prescribed in order to the salvation of souls.

“ This is proved by reason. There is a twofold reason, for which princes are bound (*tenentur*) to protect religion. One is less perfect, viz., that they may protect temporal felicity, which cannot long continue without probity of morals and religious worship. The other reason is more noble, and in order the chief; namely, because that temporal felicity, the care of which appertains to them, should be the felicity *appropriate to man*, and therefore *directed to eternal life* as to its end (*hominis propria esse debet adeoque ordinata ad vitam æternam*). But both these reasons require that princes, in defending religion, should not anticipate but follow the Church's judgments ” (n. 60).

Nothing can be more admirably thought and expressed than this. But in a later passage he pronounces himself even more unmistakably. "Civil society," he says, "ought not to care for temporal felicity absolutely and simply, but only so far as it subserves man's ultimate end, that is, spiritual good. From whence it is evident that civil society by no means acts in opposition to its proper duty, when it grants something to the Church *which in some degree may hinder temporal felicity*" (n. 77). Thus, according to our author, the civil governor is not going beyond his legitimate function, even when, instead of aiming exclusively at his people's temporal felicity, he deliberately sacrifices some degree thereof to a higher good.

Such then is the view, taken in this work, of the civil governor's province : it is not his business simply to promote the people's temporal felicity, but to promote it only in that degree and direction which may be most conducive to their eternal interests. This view we regard as undeniably the true one ; and we see at once that it removes all *theoretical* difficulty, as to imaginable conflicts between Church and State, wherever the State is sincerely Catholic.

In these days of revolutionism and secularity, we think there is hardly any doctrine which it is more important to enforce and vindicate than this of the State's religious office ; and we are very desirous, therefore, that it shall be expressed with all attainable accuracy and precision. We are induced on that account (at the risk of appearing hypercritical) to mention one or two subordinate statements of Father Tarquini on this subject, which do not at first reading strike us as altogether satisfactory. Nothing is more probable (we are well aware) than that our criticism may be based on some misconception of his full and exact meaning. And in fact there is no result of our remarks which we should hail with so much pleasure, as our obtaining a fuller elucidation of his views ; and our being thus enabled to follow his teaching no less unreservedly in his minor and subordinate opinions, than we do already in his broad and general principles.

The chief difficulty presented to ourselves by his theory on the functions of civil society may be thus drawn out : "Civil society," says Father Tarquini, as already quoted, "should not care for temporal felicity absolutely and simply, but only so far as it may be subservient to spiritual good." If this be so, surely the ultimate and adequate end of civil society would appear to be, not temporal good, but spiritual" (n. 2). But he has already laid down (n. 7) that the nature or essence of societies is determined only by their adequate end. We confess ourselves unable to see, under these circumstances, how the author has given us means for accurately distinguishing between the respective essences of ecclesiastical and civil society. We need not of course say that, in common with Father Tarquini and all Catholics, we hold the distinction between these two societies to be most signal. But it seems to us that this distinction is based on considerations which the author has not indeed denied, but which he has failed to express with due prominence and clearness. We proceed to explain our meaning.

Father Tarquini has expressly adverted to the contrast which exists between a "necessary" and a "voluntary" society (see note to n. 27), the former of course being one with which God commands us to be united. Now,

in n. 6 the author seems to express himself as though "the end" of a necessary society, no less than of a voluntary one, signified some "fixed and common end" which all its members (as such) pursue. But such a notion would surely lead to much confusion of thought. There is no ground whatever for the supposition that there is some "fixed and common end" which all members of civil society, as such, pursue. And most certainly, if there were, it would not be the end which Father Tarquini himself assigns to civil society; viz., that special kind and degree of temporal felicity which is most conducive to their spiritual welfare. By the "end" of civil society we should surely understand, not "the end in fact desired by its various members," but "the end marked out for it by God—its author."

This being understood, we should further say that the end of civil society, or (as we prefer expressing it) of civil government, is twofold,—primary and secondary. By its *primary* end we understand that end for which God directly instituted it; that end which He directly contemplated (if we may so speak) in its establishment. By its *secondary* ends we understand those various other ends which God also desires the civil governor (as such) to pursue. It is plain, moreover, that the various powers and privileges appertaining to civil government are to be understood by a reference to its *primary* end; since they are, in fact, the means placed in its hands by God for accomplishing that purpose which He designed in its establishment.

Now the primary end of civil government is either *immediate* or *ultimate*. As to its immediate primary end, we hold that this consists, neither in the promotion of spiritual good, nor even of temporal felicity in any large or full acceptation of that term; but only of exterior peace, or, as we more commonly express it in English, protection of person and property. Now it is quite impossible that exterior peace can be preserved unless there be some supreme authority having at command physical strength which is practically irresistible: God, therefore, has invested the civil governor with the rightful authority of enforcing his just commands by the employment of such physical strength. Again, it is impossible that exterior peace can be duly preserved without capital punishment: God has, therefore, given the civil governor authority to inflict such punishment. And so in regard to all the various powers conferred by God on the civil government. On the other hand, it is not at all necessary for the preservation of exterior peace, that the civil governor should possess any special and exceptional enlightenment in moral and spiritual truth: God, therefore, has not given it. Such, then, is the primary end of civil government. Its *immediate* primary end is the preservation of exterior peace; its *ultimate* primary end is the attainment of those inestimable benefits, both spiritual and temporal, which flow from exterior peace. Its powers and gifts are all those, and only those, which fit it for the maintaining of exterior peace.

We see, then, at once the broad and ineffaceable distinction between ecclesiastical and civil society. The immediate primary end of civil society is purely temporal; and God has given to it no other gifts or powers except those requisite for a temporal end. But the Church's immediate primary end is purely spiritual; viz., the sanctification of souls (see Tarquini, n. 4): and God has invested her with those gifts and powers which are requisite for so

high a mission. He has invested her, *e.g.*, with the gift of infallibly teaching dogma and morals ; with the gift of supernatural prudence in adapting means to her great end ; with the power of directly moral and religious legislation ; and with those other very numerous gifts and powers which we need not here pause to recount.

But all this is not in the slightest degree inconsistent with our proposition, that civil government has *secondary* ends also ; and it has been our main purpose, in the third article of our present number, to show on grounds of reason what *are* those secondary ends. The ruler's primary duty no doubt is the preserving of exterior peace ; and to this he is strictly obliged. Nor can the performance of this duty in itself (as distinct from any faulty *means* which he may adopt for the purpose) clash by possibility with higher ends ; for there is no other way in which he can so efficaciously promote spiritual or temporal good as by its exact fulfilment. But we maintain further, that he acts more acceptably to God in proportion as he goes beyond the strict obligation ; in proportion as he devotes the various powers with which he is intrusted, to his people's general good, both spiritual and temporal. Here, however, a vitally important distinction must be most carefully observed. So far as he labours for those kinds of temporal good which are independent of spiritual,—*e.g.*, so far as he enforces laws in regard to free trade, or currency, or railway extension, or postal facilities,—he is rightly guided in the last resort by his own judgment. But the case is widely different, so far as he pursues moral and spiritual good. This, indeed, though but a *secondary* end of civil government in the sense above explained, yet is his highest and most admirable function of all. But in its exercise he is no longer supreme ; for he has entered on that province within which the Church possesses sovereign authority. Here, then, is the civil ruler's highest office and privilege—to offer his temporal authority at the Church's feet, and labour, subordinately to her guidance, in co-operating with her to her primary end. We have already quoted Father Tarquini's statement to this precise effect.

And such (if we may trust learned men) would seem to be the Fathers' universal teaching. "It is their unanimous doctrine," says our author (n. 54), "that the . . . government of civil society should be subject to the Church, just as the body is subject to the soul." They are constantly saying, indeed, that temporal felicity is the end of civil society ; and a certain modern school of thought has understood them to mean thereby that the civil ruler transgresses his province in pursuing spiritual good. But so far are they from meaning this, that their one object is earnestly and emphatically to declare the exact contrary. Our author has brought together some of their most characteristic dicta in n. 54 ; and any one who reads them with any attention will confirm our remark. We cannot better explain the drift of these dicta than by supposing one of these holy men to address a temporal prince. "The sphere within which you are supreme," he would say, "is exclusively temporal. But it is self-evident, and you do not think of denying it, that you should, in your whole administration, preserve the temporal in its due subordination to the spiritual ; while in the spiritual order you cannot profess to be supreme. It follows, that in all your highest acts of government you should submit yourselves to the Church's teaching and admonition."

We are far from saying that this analysis exhausts the full meaning of such patristic testimonies as Father Tarquini has accumulated ; but only that it is true so far as it goes. They may undoubtedly, without any violence, be understood to imply a doctrine on the Church's indirect temporal power, closely resembling that drawn out in later ages by Suarez and Bellarmine. But, in the article to which we have so often referred, we avowedly abstain from all discussion of this question ; and we will here also abstain from such discussion.

We have dwelt so long on the relations between Church and State, because it so happens that we have considered that question at length in our present number. But it must not be supposed that the present work refers at all exclusively to that theme. On the contrary, it covers the whole subject of *Jus Ecclesiasticum Publicum*. On almost every particular, except the few subordinate statements which we have already ventured to criticise, we have only to express our unqualified admiration of Father Tarquini's labours. It is indeed most refreshing in these northern latitudes to be visited by the genial atmosphere of Rome ; and it is quite a treat to follow step by step the simple and straightforward reasoning whereby our author traces out the full extent of ecclesiastical and papal jurisdiction, which is really involved in the most elementary principles of Catholicism. We observe with particular pleasure the terms in which he speaks of the famous Gallican Declaration. He by no means treats its propositions as those which a good Catholic is at liberty to hold ; but, on the contrary, he comments on them just as he comments on Richer's and Febronius's intolerable extravagances. He speaks of all three systems as "opposed to the true constitution of the Church" (lib. ii. n. 11), and as "erroneous" (n. 22). And we commend to particular notice his summary account of the Church's true constitution (lib. ii. n. 3), which for clearness and completeness cannot be exceeded.

Good comes out of evil. It is one advantage resulting from that opposition to the Church's authority which now seems setting in from so many professedly Catholic quarters, that the Church's loyal children are led, by the study of such works as this, to contemplate more steadily, and thus to perceive more adequately, the full extent of her august prerogatives.

Tractatus de Ecclesiâ Christi. Auctore PATRICIO MURRAY, in Collegio Sancti Patricii, apud Maynooth in Hiberniâ, Sacræ Theologiæ Professore. Dublin : McGlashan & Gill.

THIS most important and valuable work has already covered considerable ground : it has treated the Church's indefectibility, visibility, unity, and sanctity, and has also discussed the Protestant rule of faith. The remaining subjects promised by Dr. Murray are such as these : the Catholic Rule of Faith ; Authority of the governing Church ; the Object-matter of the Church's Authority, whether as teaching or governing ; the Head of the Church ; the Notes of the Church, &c.

We cannot but regard it as one of the most important scientific theological treatises written by a Catholic * in these islands for the last three centuries. It supplies a want not in British only, but in European, or rather Ecumenical Catholic theology. It is well known that S. Thomas and the scholastics who follow his arrangement have devoted far less space to the "*De Ecclesiâ*" and kindred subjects than corresponds even to their intrinsic importance; for surely the political and social organization of Christianity is an extremely important part of theological science on its own ground. But in these days the doctrines in question have assumed peculiar interest. The very first principles of belief are now everywhere called into question; and it is a matter of great moment that (not clerics only but) educated laymen shall be thoroughly instructed in the argumentative ground on which our faith rests. This has, indeed, been emphatically urged by Dr. Murray himself in various parts of his "*Annual Miscellany*," and will be generally admitted. But the argumentative foundation of our faith is indissolubly bound up with the doctrine "*De Ecclesiâ*," and cannot by possibility be treated apart from that doctrine.

We defer, of course, our direct comment on this work until its completion. Here we will but express our warm admiration of the way in which Dr. Murray has executed his task, so far as it has advanced. To say that on one or two open questions we are not entirely in accord with it, is merely to say that no Catholic will precisely agree with any other on every open point. But such small differences of opinion in no way affect the feelings of admiration which we have just expressed. Three characteristics are particularly worthy of notice. (1) The clearness and definiteness with which Dr. Murray has thought out the various doctrines which he enunciates. He never takes refuge in vague generalities to save himself the trouble of coming to a clear and distinct view; but in each case places a precise and definite thought first before his own mind, and then before that of others. (2) His Scriptural quotations are not confined to the citation of individual passages, which may or may not be precisely relevant. He carefully examines each in its context; and not unfrequently takes very great pains, and argues at considerable length, to show without doubt that the passage is really to his purpose. (3) He takes singular pains to understand Protestant objections from the Protestant point of view. In the case of many Catholic controversialists, we are far more confident that their direct arguments are solid and cogent than we are that they rightly understand their opponent's standpoint. But the most prejudiced Protestants can hardly think this of Dr. Murray; and he has prepared himself for his task by the careful study of a large number of the most important Protestant works.

We sincerely hope that Dr. Murray will be enabled to proceed with his labours, and bring them rapidly to a conclusion.

* Father Newman's "*Essay on Development*," it will be remembered, was not written by him when he was a Catholic, though its publication took place after his conversion.

The Minor Prophets. With a Commentary explanatory and practical, and Introductions to the several Books. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. Parts I.—III. (From Hosea to Micah, ch. i.) Oxford, Cambridge, and London.

THE pages before us are the first instalment towards the completion of a scheme which was much talked of in Oxford many years ago, but which seems to have lain dormant till quite lately. Dr. Pusey and his friends proposed to put together a commentary on the whole Bible, which should supply the want urgently felt of something more satisfactory than the long-established quartos of D'Oyley and Mant. Different books were to be entrusted to different writers, and in this way it was intended to produce the whole commentary within a comparatively short space of time. Various causes have delayed the accomplishment of the plan; but, if we may judge from the specimen before us, its completion will enrich the literature of the Anglican Establishment with a very valuable work. It is probably by far the best plan to divide the labour, not only to save time, but for the more important reason, that no single student can well hope to deal satisfactorily with more than one or two of the great portions of Scripture, and, except in the case of books so short as those of the Minor Prophets, with more than a few of the sacred writers. The best commentaries in all languages have been partial ones: it is only from the great convenience of having a complete work that A. Lapide and Calmet rank so high, though the judgment of the former is remarkably sound everywhere, and his instincts thoroughly religious and Catholic. But few portions of this or any general commentary can be compared with the monographs of Toletus, Pererius, or Agellius, or with the works of Ribera on the Minor Prophets, or Justiniani on the Epistles of St. Paul. It remains, of course, to be seen of what calibre the writers are to be who are to undertake individual portions of the Commentary of which Dr. Pusey is, we suppose, the general editor. It is not likely that either Oxford or the Anglican Establishment will produce men so fit to undertake any other portion of Sacred Scripture as Dr. Pusey himself for the part that he has chosen—the Minor Prophets, and perhaps Isaiah.

The Commentary will be voluminous, if other departments of it preserve the same relative proportion between text and annotation as that before us. The twelve Prophets will hardly be included in less than a quarto of 800 pages. It should be remembered, also, that it is meant for practical use, rather than to supply all the requirements of the student and the critic. Dr. Pusey gives us the result of his own researches and learning; but he does not often give the process by which the result has been attained. This in such a commentary is, perhaps, a gain; but we cannot help sometimes wishing that a writer who has spent so many years in the study of Hebrew, and of all that can bear on the Old Testament, should give us rather more criticism than he does. At the same time, it is a relief to be spared the long catalogues of names and authorities for different opinions which take up so large a space in some commentaries on the Bible. We do not *always* want the whole history of opinion on a passage. It is almost a relief to think that biblical literature is becoming so multitudinous, that writers are obliged to

spare us this parade of authorities, lest it should leave them no room for their own remarks. Dr. Pusey's commentary flows on thus without much interruption or discussion, though there are peculiarities about his style which amount to as specific a mannerism as any that is to be found among Methodist or Evangelical writers, and which may sometimes even puzzle a reader not previously acquainted with his writings.

It is interesting to have the opinion of one so well fitted to judge on the use that has been made of late of the cognate Semitic languages for illustration of the meanings of Hebrew words. Of course, no scholar of Dr. Pusey's eminence would question the value of such illustration: still the principle itself may be pushed too far. It was said not long ago, for instance, that a Hebrew scholar without a knowledge of the cognate languages was no better off than a Greek scholar who had read nothing but Ionic or Doric Greek. But the principle is one thing, and the use made of it another. Let us hear what Dr. Pusey says—he is speaking of the translators of the Anglican Bible: "They had most of the helps for understanding Hebrew which we have—the same traditional knowledge from the ancient versions, Jewish commentators, or lexicographers, or grammarians, with the exception of the Jewish-Arabic school only, as well as the study of the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, and they used these aids with more mature and even judgment than has mostly been employed in the subsequent period. Hebrew criticism has now escaped, for the most part, from the arbitrariness which detected a various reading in any variation of a single old version, or in the error of some small fraction of MSS., which disfigured the commentaries of Lowth, Newcome, and Blayney. But the comparison of the cognate dialects opened for the time an unlimited licence of innovation. Every principle of interpretation, every rule of language was violated. The Bible was misinterpreted with a wild recklessness to which no other book was ever subjected. A subordinate meaning of some half-understood Arabic word was always at hand to remove whatever any one disliked. Now, the manifoldness of this reign of misrule has subsided. But interpretations as arbitrary as any that have perished still hold their sway, or from time to time emerge; and any revisal of the authorized version of the Old Testament, until the precarious use of the dialects shall be far more settled, would give us chaff for wheat, introducing an indefinite amount of error into the Word of God."—(Introd. pp. vii. viii.)

Although the method adopted in the commentary itself keeps down to a great extent any display of erudition, the references as well as the introductions to the several Prophets evince immense and conscientious research. Every kind of illustration—historical, physical, geographical, and scientific—is at hand. The introductions themselves are extremely valuable. We may notice, in particular, one feature that at the present moment has a peculiar interest of its own: we mean the attention drawn by Dr. Pusey to the fact, that the Prophets he illustrates use in a thousand places language and imagery drawn from the Pentateuch. This fact indubitably proves not only their own every-day use of the earlier portions of the Bible, but that those to whom they prophesied—princes and people, whether in the kingdom of Israel or of Judah—had the contents of the books of Moses "familiar to their ears as household words."

De Prisca Refutatione Hæreseon, Origenis nomine ac Philosophoumenon titulo recens vulgata, Commentarius TORQUATI ARMELLINI, e Societate Jesu. Romæ: Typis Civiltatis Cattolicæ. 1862.

THIS dissertation proposes to add another name to the list of candidates for the authorship of the celebrated "Philosophoumena." Padre Armellini thinks he can make out a good claim for the schismatic Novatian.

No hypothesis hitherto offered has completely satisfied the critical world. Origen at present has few supporters. The warmest advocates for Tertullian allow that grave objections can be alleged against his claim. The more generally received opinion which attributes the work to Hippolytus rests on a number of assumptions, grounded on no sufficient foundation. On the other hand, the merits of the work, the prominent fact of the author's connection with Rome, his own assertion of his high ecclesiastical rank, his antagonism to the Popes, and his schismatical leanings, forbid the abandonment of the inquiry. Does not Novatian unite in his person the several characteristics which we gather from the pages of the "Philosophoumena" for the identification of the writer? Or does the work furnish any intrinsic evidence which compels us to exclude his name?

A preliminary difficulty is presented by the chronology. Döllinger and the generality of those who have written on the subject take it for granted that the author of the "Philosophoumena" belongs to the earlier portion of the third century. The history of Novatian cannot be traced with certainty; the dates, such as they are, would oblige us to extend the lifetime of the author beyond the middle of the third century. Padre Armellini remarks that the latest heretic whose name occurs in the "Philosophoumena" is Alcibiades of Apamea in Syria. We meet with the same name in Theodoret, and from him we learn that Origen wrote against Alcibiades; Eusebius, in his account of Origen's labours, unhesitatingly fixes the date of the revival of the sect of the Helcesaitæ by Alcibiades in the interval A.D. 246-9. The composition of the "Philosophoumena" must therefore be placed after the middle of the third century. The earliest limit can only be guessed at; the heretic Prepo, a disciple of Marcion, is mentioned as writing against Bardesanes "nostris hisce temporibus;" from the fact that Prepo's name nowhere appears in the writings of Rhodo or Tertullian, we infer that Prepo wrote subsequently to the death of Bardesanes, which Theodoret places near the year 180. These dates, Padre Armellini contends, may easily be reconciled with the hypothesis of Novatian being the author of the "Philosophoumena."

Suppose that Novatian was born about the year 180; that he fell ill towards 215; received baptism when in danger of death, and was ordained priest shortly after;—this will allow of his occupying a position of influence during the reign of Pope Zephyrinus: he may easily survive to become the author of the wretched schism of 251, and even suffer a violent death during the persecution of Valerian, 253—268, assuming the correctness of the suspected account given by Socrates (H. E., l. iv. c. 28). The "Philosophoumena" will thus fall within the second half of the third century, and

the attitude of its author during the second phase of the Sabellian heresy will become intelligible.

Antiquity can furnish little external evidence for Novatian's claim: no work in any way corresponding to the "*Philosophoumena*" appears in the list of Novatian's writings; neither is there trace of the other treatises which the author of the "*Philosophoumena*" says he had given to the world. On the other hand, S. Jerome mentions expressly that Novatian wrote "*multa alia*," in addition to the books the names of which are preserved. His fall from unity would condemn his works to obscurity; and the loss of a treatise on heresies, composed in Greek at Rome, at a time when the knowledge of that language was on the decline, need not excite much surprise: possibly, the work was not published till after the death of Novatian, and then its circulation would naturally have been confined to his own followers.

Assuming Novatian's authorship, many valuable arguments may be drawn from the work in support of the hypothesis. The writer displays an erudition such as we find attributed to Novatian; above all, he is familiar with the Gentile philosophy, and Novatian was reproached for the preference he avowed for its study: nay, some of his opponents attributed his rigourism to the principles he had borrowed from the Stoics. The methodical arrangement and the perspicuous style of the "*Philosophoumena*" also correspond with what we should expect from the schismatical leader. Sympathy with Tertullian, fondness for his writings, the employment of his arguments, points frequently objected to by the Novatians, may be traced in the "*Philosophoumena*." The use of the Greek language will not appear singular, if we remember that Novatian was deeply imbued with Greek philosophy, and that Latin writers of the same date are known to have composed works in Greek. Tertullian, as we learn from his own testimony, had composed two works in Greek. More serious is the objection drawn from the style of the "*Philosophoumena*." Novatian wrote in a turgid, grandiose style: it cannot be said of the "*Philosophoumena*" that they are chargeable with this defect; but the nature of the subject may account for the more subdued tone, the rather as the use of a strange language might be expected to check the flow of a writer's eloquence.

Again, how obviously the condition of the *ἀρχιερασία*, the high priesthood, so pompously claimed by the writer of the "*Philosophoumena*," finds its fulfilment in Novatian! The work, we have seen, must not be placed before the middle of the third century: Novatian appears as Antipope, most probably in 251. And be it remarked that this very distinctive condition, in one who evidently was outside of the school of Callixtus,—i.e., the Catholic Church,—but who never claims his dignity during the reign of Callixtus, cannot with any appearance of probability be explained in the case of the other alleged authors of the "*Philosophoumena*."

The personal antipathy indulged in against the saintly Callixtus by the writer of the treatise in question admits of a plausible explanation in the case of Novatian. For Novatian, we conjecture, was ordained priest during the reign of Pope Zephyrinus: from the letter of Pope Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch we learn that he was baptized when in danger of death, and that his ordination was opposed by the clergy and the people on the ground of

the irregularity which at that time attached to clinical baptism. Now, Callixtus was archdeacon under Pope Zephyrinus, and the duty of remonstrating against Novatian as a candidate for holy orders would devolve upon him. In a temper like Novatian's that remonstrance could not fail to awake a feeling of deep resentment and personal animosity, which the death of its object was not likely to remove, especially when the dignity of the Papacy had added fuel to the original cause of pique.

The rigourism of the author of the "*Philosophoumena*," the blame he attaches to Callixtus for extending the benefits of reconciliation to all sinners, his anxiety to refuse this grace to fallen bishops, constitute a further resemblance with Novatian. Indeed, the very arguments attributed in the "*Philosophoumena*" to Pope Callixtus identically re-appear in the treatises composed by S. Pacian against Novatian. In the ninth book there occurs a doubtful passage, from which, taken in conjunction with the context, we may gather that the writer condemned second marriages. From Theodoret we learn that at first they were not censured by Novatian; but it may be inferred that his ideas became more narrowed as he advanced; and it is beyond doubt that the eighth canon of the Council of Nice required from the Novatian converts to the Church a promise to hold communion with persons who had entered the marriage state a second time.

Of all the writings of Novatian we possess only two letters and a treatise on the Trinity. The author of the "*Philosophoumena*" states his belief on this mystery at some length, and a comparison of their doctrine and theology regarding the Trinity will always be a crucial test of the soundness of Padre Armellini's theory. At the outset we are met by the avowal of the author that he went to such lengths in opposing Sabellius, that he was reproached by Callixtus as a ditheist: whereas the orthodoxy of Novatian on this point of belief is supposed to have been settled by the labours of Maran and Bull. Padre Armellini, however, contends that the real belief of the writer of the "*Philosophoumena*" will be placed beyond a doubt if we turn from the language employed against Pope Callixtus—language prompted perhaps by warmth of controversy,—and consider his calmer professions. It is certain that he unreservedly condemns the tritheism of the Perata, and declares his belief that God is one; it is certain that he recognizes the consubstantiality of the Son; he acknowledges that "God begotten of the Father" "took flesh in the womb of the Virgin." This doubt regarding the orthodoxy of the writer removed, a striking parallelism is drawn between "*Novatian de Trinitate*," c. 27, and "*Philosophoumena*," l. xvi. c. 3.; "*Novatian*," cc. 15, 31, and "*Philosophoumena*," l. x. c. 3.; and in both treatises a remarkable silence is observed regarding the Holy Ghost—by Novatian throughout, by the author of the "*Philosophoumena*" where he makes profession of fully stating the true doctrine concerning the Deity. During the Sabellian controversy it was to be expected that less attention would be drawn to the relations of the third Person of the Adorable Trinity: this unexpected coincidence between Novatian and the author of the "*Philosophoumena*" must be allowed to confirm Padre Armellini's hypothesis.

At first sight, the placing of the Quartodecimans among the heretics would seem to militate against Novatian's claim. But, if it be remembered

that the Novatians adopted the Quartodeciman error only after the death of their leader, during the reign of Valens, and that Socrates expressly bears witness that the Novatians at Rome conformed to the practice of the Universal Church, it will be plain that the objection is only apparent. One more difficult to deal with is to be found in the condemnation of re-baptism by the writer of the "Philosophoumena." The Novatians were reproached by S. Cyprian for baptizing those who joined their schism: the fact is very fully authenticated. Does not this opposition compel us to abandon Novatian's pretensions? Padre Armellini thinks that Novatian might quibble about the name, deny the validity of the first baptism, and assert the Novatian rite to be in fact the first. Unfortunately this was the defence adopted by the African *rebaptizantes*, who are held up as innovators in the "Philosophoumena;" and Padre Armellini himself does not consider the explanation satisfactory. He conjectures that the attack on Agrippinus may be intended as a cover under which Novatian wishes to revenge the opposition raised by the archdeacon Callixtus to his ordination, on the plea of the irregularity incurred by his baptism at the point of death. Perhaps more weight may be allowed to the known dishonesty of Novatian: the writer of the "Opusculum contra Novatianum" mentions one of his resources to have been to bring against his adversaries the very accusations brought against himself. At least, there is reason for pausing before deciding the question of the authorship of the "Philosophoumena" against Novatian on account of this one apparent divergency regarding second baptism, in which the parallelism between the author of the "Philosophoumena" and Novatian seems to fail.

It is not our intention at present to test Padre Armellini's view by a closer comparison with the "Philosophoumena." Our purpose has been to give an outline of his argument. On the whole we think he has assigned sufficient reasons why the claim of Novatian ought to be carefully weighed. The general resemblance between Novatian and the writer of the "Refutation of all Heresies" is very striking: the more prominent objections, as we have seen, may be answered satisfactorily; and we think that little remains but to institute a more minute comparison. At the same time, we would respectfully suggest to Padre Armellini whether it would not be well to clear up the uncertainty in which Novatian's career at present remains, and, if possible, to add further confirmations of the period assigned for the composition of the work. For, after all, the postponement of the composition of the "Philosophoumena" to the second part of the third century is the *postulatum* which previous writers on this vexed question would be much disposed to deny.

The History of Girolamo Savonarola and of his Times. By PASQUALE VILLARI, Professor of History in the University of Pisa. Translated from the Italian by LEONARD HORNER, F.R.S., with the co-operation of the Author. 2 vols. London : Longmans. 1863.

MR. HORNER has translated a work which cannot fail to interest many readers, and for most will possess not a little novelty. Hitherto, with the exception of Dr. Madden's somewhat imperfect and inaccurate work, and an able chapter in Rio's "Poetry of Christian Art," no biography or work of any great value has appeared in the English language relating to Savonarola. And although the pens of many foreign historians have not been idle, yet the vicissitudes of Savonarola's posthumous fame, scarcely less remarkable than the fitful and feverish character of his actual career, have been such as to leave ample room for the labours of any fresh biographer. Many men are heroes or wretches according as they are estimated by friends or enemies. But there are few who do duty in so many causes, or are claimed by so many adverse parties, as the Florentine friar. That writers of his own order, fired with an enthusiasm caught directly from him, should worship him as a combination of all excellencies, a profound philosopher and politician, a wise legislator, an eloquent preacher, as well as a prophet, saint, and martyr ; that others, such as the sceptical Bayle and the Jesuit Rastrelli, should find in him nothing to admire, and should consign his name to contempt as a low and ridiculous impostor ;—is not so wonderful. But it is astonishing that, friar as he was, he should be extolled by religious Protestant writers as the first to raise the standard of Biblical Christianity against the corrupt traditions of Rome ; that he should be considered to have begun what Luther was destined to complete ; to have anticipated that reformer in his doctrine of justification by faith only ; and to have been in Italy what Wycliffe was in England, and Huss in Bohemia, a morning star of the Reformation. And perhaps more wonderful still is the zeal with which modern authors have striven to set him up as a champion of civil and religious liberty, a leveller, and a revolutionist alike in theory and practice. The public, therefore, may well be curious to see whether, under Professor Villari's hands, Savonarola undergoes any fresh transformation.

A thorough acquaintance with Italian history, a clear head, and lively style, are the qualifications which Professor Villari has brought to the task of studying and re-writing Savonarola's life. He has evidently spared neither diligence nor labour. Many years were occupied in reading all the modern works—Italian, German, French, and English—in examining the statements of contemporaneous writers, in analysing the works of Savonarola himself, and carefully reading and collating original documents, many of which Professor Villari had for the first time discovered. No one can read the book without admiring the patient research of the author into every source of information, though we are reluctantly compelled to remark that he would have better consulted the convenience of future students, had he been less loose and vague in his references. In other respects he has addressed himself to his task in the true spirit of historical criticism. He saw the necessity of

submitting the details of Savonarola's epoch to a searching scrutiny. He has accordingly examined with much care the constitution of Florence, the political state of Italy, and the tendencies of philosophical speculation in the fifteenth century.

The result is a triumphant vindication of the Catholicity of Savonarola in point of doctrine. Whatever he was, he was not what is now understood by a "Bible Christian." His views neither coincided with, nor in any way led to, the *servum arbitrium* of Luther or the predestination of Calvin. A reformer, indeed, he was, but in the sense in which the Council of Trent was a reforming council—initiating a work which was afterwards to be carried out, with more prudence and on a grander scale, but scarcely with more zeal, by S. Charles Borromeo and S. Pius V. As a refutation, therefore, of the extravagant fancies of Rudelbach, Meier, and all who would make of Savonarola a thoroughgoing Protestant, Professor Villari's book is highly satisfactory. Henceforth, whatever view be taken of the friar's conduct, at least we shall be spared the pain of seeing him dressed up in Protestant disguise. Similarly impossible will it be, for the future, to adopt the notion of his having been a hypocrite, or a mere fanatic. The testimony of all his contemporaries, whether friendly or hostile, to the purity of his life and the disinterestedness of his conduct, makes it impossible to doubt his sincerity; whilst the depth and general sobriety of his views on all the great questions of politics, philosophy, and theology, shown in the many able treatises he wrote, equally disprove the charge of fanaticism.

So far the labours of Professor Villari have proved eminently successful. But he is not so happy in his attempt to assign to Savonarola his real place in the history of Italy and of mankind. "He exhibited," says the Professor, "a combination of genius with superstition, of profound reasoning with trivial sophisms, of sublime heroism with occasionally most unexpected weakness, but, substantially, a lofty, generous, and powerful nature." Such an estimate has all the appearance of impartiality, and is, perhaps, not far from the truth. But there is nothing in the facts brought together by Villari to justify the following rhapsodies scattered up and down the work: "He had within a spirit of aggression which he had no desire to conceal, but was rather anxious to avow. He was the first to raise up, and display before the world, the standard of that epoch which many call the Renaissance. He was the first, in the fifteenth century, to make men feel that a new life had penetrated to and had awakened the human race; and hence he may be justly called the prophet of a new civilization."* "The men of that time foresaw a new and more vast synthesis of the human race, and felt that they were approaching nearer to God. The blood beat in their pulses with feverish strength; ideas

* If the passage given above may be taken as a fair specimen of the translator's faithfulness to the original, we cannot compliment him on the manner in which he has executed his task. Literally rendered, it runs thus:—"There was in him a spirit of innovation, which we have no wish to conceal; on the contrary, it is the chief object of our work to bring it to the light. Savonarola was the first to raise on high, and to unfurl before the eyes of the world, that banner which many call the banner of the *Rinascenza*. He was the first, in the fifteenth century, to feel that a new life, &c."

followed each other with feverish rapidity ; they were subject to a power greater than themselves, which launched them into an unknown ocean, to discover a land unknown, but divine." "Columbus opened the paths of the ocean, Savonarola began to open those of the Spirit. Both believed themselves to have been sent by God to spread Christianity over the earth ; both had strange visions, which aroused each to his appointed work ; both laid their hand upon a new world, unconscious of its immensity." "He was the first in his time to direct humanity to that goal which, to this day, we have not reached, but to which we are now advancing with redoubled strength. It was his desire that reason and faith, religion and liberty, might meet in harmonious union ; but he did not think that a new system of religious doctrine became therefore necessary." "And when that reform, the necessity of which has become a universal conviction, shall have advanced to the reality of facts, Christianity will have arrived at its true and full development, and Italy will again be at the head of a renovated civilization. Perhaps men may then better comprehend the character and the life of him who, for that cause, suffered a glorious martyrdom !"

This is the language of a believer in the eternal progress of the human race, of a partisan of republican ideas, and an adversary of the Catholic hierarchy. The divine mission of Savonarola was, on this hypothesis, identical with that of modern revolution, or, at best, of those very moderate Catholics and progressists who, with every admiration for their religion as a body of abstract doctrine, feel the influence of the Church in the concrete a burden and an encumbrance. To imagine a land unknown, but divine, somewhere outside the existing constitution of the Church ; to open up a path of the Spirit, above and beyond the path shown us by her actual rulers ; to approach nearer to God by unauthorised ways ; to spread a Christianity over the earth more perfect than that which has all along existed ; in a word, to reform the Church according to ideas never sanctioned by her when reforming herself, is nothing more or less than to map out an Utopia which never has been, and never can be, identical with the Church of Christ. This sort of sublimated Catholicity has been the dream of many with just enough of speculative faith to make them adhere to Catholic dogma, but without that humble, practical, and obedient faith, which accepts God's Church as a dominant reality, rightly claiming to make its influence and authority felt in every sphere of human existence. To adopt it is to launch upon a sea, vast and desolate, across whose waters the Spirit who rules and animates the Church sends none of His enlightening rays, and whose waves assuredly will never carry the presumptuous souls who commit themselves to it to any divine or heavenly shore.

But it is not our business now to expose the fallacies of liberalism and naturalism in general : we have only to inquire by the light of Professor Villari's own narrative whether, in point of fact, Savonarola is to be looked upon as a champion by anticipation of those modern theories of progress and independence which make up what is called the new civilization. Was it, or was it not, to promote such theories that Savonarola sacrificed his life ? Professor Villari's own work shall supply in great measure the data for our solution of this question.

The whole of Savonarola's history turns upon two cardinal facts : his hostility to the actual rulers of Florence, and his antagonism to the Court of Rome. The problems to be solved in respect of these facts are : whether in assailing the former he was struggling to promote republicanism in the modern sense of the word ; and whether his disobedience to the latter was owing to a dislike on principle of the temporal power of the Pope, and to a theoretic exclusion of the Church from the spheres of science and politics.

Material progress and moral stagnation had long before trained Florence for a dynastic yoke which had its origin in the democratical party, and which succeeded, early in the fifteenth century, in the establishment of a despotic sway amidst the dead forms of a republican constitution. The family of the Medici had, after occasional reverses, riveted itself tightly on the neck of the republic, and at the date of Savonarola's appointment to the priory of S. Mark, Lorenzo the Magnificent held the destinies of Florence entirely in his own hands. The fruits of the loss of freedom, and of the oppressive Medicean rule, had already attained a frightful development. Corruption reigned in every department of the State, and the poor were the victims of a heartless usury. The *Accademia Platonica*, started by Gemistus under the patronage of Cosmo de' Medici, and revived by the joint efforts of Lorenzo de' Medici and Ficino, had introduced into philosophy, and every other branch of knowledge, ideas essentially pagan. Gemistus, indeed, seems to have entertained the hope of a revival of the worship of the heathen deities ; whilst Ficino reduced the proofs of the truth of Christianity to the testimony of the Sibyls, of Virgil, and of Plato, and the comforting assurance of Porphyry that the gods had benignly borne witness in favour of Jesus Christ. Through the influence of Lorenzo a philosophy, which was a fusion of Neo-Platonism with scraps gathered from all heathen antiquity, had become, along with the revived study of the classics, the universal rage at Florence. Some talked wildly of calling on the Pope to canonize Plato, who already received religious honours in the Academy. The highest merit—we are sorry to find that Professor Villari considers it a merit—of Ficino's philosophy was to clear the way for the bold pantheism of Giordano Bruno.

This paganism had spread quickly from philosophy to every branch of science and art. The whole intellect and taste of Florence lay prostrate at the feet of paganism. Everywhere the Christian element was fast disappearing ; literature, slavishly tied down to ancient models, had lost all nerve and vigour ; Tibullus, Catullus, and even Ovid's "*Art of Love*" were favourite books in the schools ; a taste had arisen for bastard classic buildings ; the sensuous element in painting was rapidly developed ; pagan decorations filled the churches, and pagan illustrations and allusions supplanted Scripture and the Fathers in Christian pulpits. The practice of religion was confined to mere external ceremony ; and those who led the age in taste, skill, and refinement had not only lost all faith themselves, but held up its defenders to universal ridicule. It is not surprising that under these circumstances paganism re-appeared in the sphere of morals. Licentiousness was frightfully prevalent in all ranks, and oppression of the poor, the inevitable consequence of throwing the religion of the poor into the shade, was a crime common to almost all the banking class, to which the Medici belonged.

Such was the state of things which afflicted the heart of the devout Savonarola when he came to Florence. Though master of no despicable amount of knowledge in all "the learning of the Egyptians," he was too deeply versed in purely ecclesiastical studies, too thoroughly imbued with the principles of S. Thomas and the lessons he had learnt from constant meditation on Scripture at the foot of his crucifix, too practically schooled to humility and mortification, not to be deeply moved by the shocking spectacle of the Cross trampled under foot, or, at best, set aside to make way for the insignia of paganism. This paganism, then, was the hydra-headed enemy he set himself singlehanded to combat in all its forms. And it was only because he saw that the Medici were at the bottom of all these evils, that he withstood their influence, and strove with all his incomparable energies to arrest the unconstitutional exercise of their usurped authority. The triumph of the Cross was the object he had at heart, and the Cross could only triumph by the ruin of paganism, and of those to whom paganism owed its ascendancy. This, and not revolution or democracy for their own sakes, was the object of all his endeavours. He never disguised his own deeply-seated love of monarchical principles. Had a monarchy on any true basis been possible for Florence, he would never, when the current of events forced him against his will into the position of a legislator, have contented himself with giving to his city a constitution partly traditional in Tuscany, partly modelled on that of Venice. His own ideal was evidently unattainable, so he fell back upon republicanism, and that not the republicanism of our times, as the system least likely under the circumstances to undo his work of destroying paganism. He had no other theory of progress to apply in the sphere of politics, except the establishment of sufficient liberty to admit of the triumph of religion. For proofs of the correctness of this view we have only to appeal to the pages of Professor Villari. We base our conclusions on the facts which he narrates, merely disengaging them from the theories he so eagerly supports. It is simply monstrous, in the face of those facts, to exhibit Savonarola as one of the *New Men*, a prophet of the New Civilization, half a Neo-Platonist in philosophy, and wholly a Democrat in politics. It is another question whether he always acted with prudence in the selection of means for realizing his projects. Sometimes, doubtless, his enthusiasm carried him beyond the limits of discretion; but the evils to be contended against were so gigantic that measures less energetic and decisive than those he employed would in all probability have been ineffectual.

Savonarola's antagonism to the Court of Rome was produced by causes similar to those which roused him against the Medici. He had fallen on the evil days of Pope Alexander VI.—days of avarice, luxury, and infidelity. Making every deduction on the score of malicious misrepresentation and exaggeration, it is impossible to deny that the Borgia family were a great scandal to Italy and the Church. We are not prepared to accept with Professor Vallari's unquestioning faith the simoniacal character of Alexander's election to the Papacy. Muratori has long since ably disposed of that accusation. Nor can we repeat unhesitatingly after Guicciardini the monstrous stories which he relates of Alexander's hideous immorality, though,

unlike many of his followers, putting them forth only as vague rumours, originated by the lampoons of licentious Neapolitan poets. But it is clear that frightful disorders did at that time exist in and about the Court of Rome, and that everything which came to Savonarola's ears was calculated to excite the indignation of a man jealous, as he was, of the dignity and holiness of the sacred ministry. With a corrupt clergy, and a Papal Court stained with the vices of ambition, luxury, and avarice, he saw little reason to expect permanent reform in the manners of the Florentines or any other peoples in Italy. The vengeance of God hanging over his country perpetually haunted his imagination and pierced his heart, till he worked himself up to a belief in his own divine call to denounce these evils from the pulpit, and to lash unsparingly all manner of wickedness in high places. Meanwhile, his theories of Church government and his doctrine on the subject of obedience were wholly in accord with those of S. Thomas and the greatest theologians in the Church. "It is manifest," he says, in the "Triumph of the Cross," "that all the faithful ought to rally round the Holy Father, as supreme head of the Roman Church, mistress of all other Churches, and that *whosoever departs from the doctrine of the Church of Rome departs from Christ*." And in one of his sermons: "When it clearly appears that the commands of our superiors are contrary to those of God, and especially to what charity demands, no one in such a case ought to obey them, for it is written: 'Oportet obedire magis Deo quam hominibus.' *If, however, the case be not self-evident, if there be the slightest doubt, then we ought always to obey.*" When he came to apply this principle to his own case he may or may not have been under a delusion. In the one hypothesis, the plea of special inspiration, put in for his conduct by Natalis Alexander and other writers of high name and unsuspected orthodoxy, must be admitted; in the other, the fault lay, not in the erroneousness of his principles, but in their mistaken application. We may lament the weakness which broke down under that most trying test of supernatural heroism, the call to give up a holy work at a critical moment in the spirit of submission to ecclesiastical authority; but we can neither condemn him as a heretic, nor extol him as a precursor of modern liberalism or theoretic rebellion against the temporal power of the Pope. If he wandered for a time, transgressing the bounds of Christian prudence and holy obedience, at any rate the sufferings he underwent at his trial brought him to his senses. He not only died a true son of the Church, but, the feverishness of the past having subsided, he, in the spirit of penance and heroic resignation, washed out with his blood (as we may confidently believe) whatever stain of imperfection he had, through misguided enthusiasm, contracted.

"Nothing is here for tears, nothing to wail,
Or knock the breast; no weakness, no contempt,
Dispraise, or blame; nothing but well and fair,
And what may quiet us in a death so noble."

Upon this portion of his history the documents discovered by Professor Villari have thrown much additional light. The records of all his examinations are now before the world—indelible monuments at once of Savonarola's heroism, and of the treacherous malice of his unscrupulous persecutors.

We cannot close this notice without drawing attention to a strange blunder which occurs in one of the author's notes (vol. ii. p. 61). He there says that Julius II. issued, Jan. 14, 1505, a bull, which he caused to be confirmed by the Lateran Council, in which the election of Alexander was declared to be null, and that it could not be considered to have acquired any validity by the subsequent homage of the cardinals. It was not likely that Julius would have published a bull which would invalidate his own election no less than that of his predecessor. And, in fact, Alexander's name does not once occur in the bull in question, which is entirely prospective in all its clauses, and could, of course, have no retrospective value. The most that can be said is, that Julius was probably induced to draw up this instrument by his knowledge, or suspicion, of simoniacal practices in recent elections.

It will be apparent from what has been said, that Professor Villari's book is more valuable for its facts than for its theories. He has demolished the fanciful labours of many of his predecessors: it is a pity that, with all his diligence and acumen, he should have produced in their stead a portrait of Savonarola wonderfully accurate in detail, but wholly unfaithful in the general impression which it conveys. It is impossible to recommend without reserve a book which makes the history of Savonarola serve the cause of a liberalism and a moderate Catholicism to which that fervent friar was wholly a stranger, and from which every feeling of his pious heart would have recoiled with horror.

Vie de la Vénérable Mère Agnès de Jésus, Religieuse de l'Ordre de Saint Dominique, etc. Par M. DE LANTAGES, Prêtre de Saint-Sulpice. Nouvelle édition, soigneusement revue et considérablement augmentée, par M. l'Abbé LUCOT. 2 tom. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand.

Vie de la Bienheureuse Esprit de Jésus, du Tiers Ordre de Saint Dominique. Ecrite par M. JEAN DUPONT, corrigée par le R. P. Fr. AMBROISE PORTON, des Frères Prêcheurs. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand. (Bibliothèque Dominicaine.)

La Vénérable Jeanne Marie de la Croix, Franciscaine, et son Epoque: Tableau du XVIIème. Siècle. Par BEDE WEBER. Traduit par CHARLES SAINTE-FOR. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand. (Bibliothèque Franciscaine.)

Madame Acarie: Étude sur la Société Religieuse au XVIème et XVIIème Siècles. Par G. DE CADOUAL. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand.

THE religious press of France—on which, for the present, it is our own lot to depend in great measure for such productions—is, we are happy to see, becoming yearly more and more prolific in such volumes as the first three of those which we have here grouped together. The endless variety of character that is found among the Saints and servants of God,—even among those, the most prominent of all, but still limited in number, who have reached, or are on their way to, the honours of Beatification and Canonization—multiplying indefinitely the aspects of that one perfect Pattern of which all are partial reflections—seems also to point to a corresponding variety

of needs and tastes among the children of the Church, who have not one saintly example too many to help them to the understanding and imitation of the character of the Incarnate Word. We need hardly say, then, that we welcome the lives before us with great gratitude; all the more, perhaps, because, when due precautions are taken and the legitimate sanctions obtained, they are safer than other classes of spiritual works. We have heard of books of devotion and asceticism being "got up" simply for the market. In England we are unfortunately less in danger from such speculations, as they would not be very likely to prove remunerative; but in France, where the "market" is so extensive and the demand so great, such things have been, and are. It is less easy, however, to do this with the Lives of holy persons.

Three of the Lives before us belong to the seventeenth century,—a period with the saintly treasures of which we are not yet half acquainted. Two of them relate to persons whose "causes" have been introduced at Rome, and who would probably have been long ago beatified but for the troublous times at the close of the eighteenth century. In the matter of beatifications, as well as in so many other departments, we are now laboriously making up for the evil done, and the good prevented or delayed, by the events of those disastrous times. The same two—the Mère Agnes de Jésus, and Jeanne Marie de la Croix—bring us across some of the most notable instances of the work of Catholic revival and restoration of the time in which they lived—the labours of M. Olier for the improvement of the French clergy, and the noble stand made in the Tyrol and elsewhere by the House of Austria during the Thirty Years' War. The path of the other—Esprite de Jésus—lay entirely out of the way of anything that can be called historical.

Agnes Galand was the daughter of a poor cutler of Puy, born in 1602. She grew up under the shadow of the celebrated shrine of our Blessed Lady for which that place is famous, and we find her earliest years full of instances of that attraction to piety, devotion, charity, and mortification, which so often marks the opening career of highly privileged souls. At a very early age she made a vow never to marry: she was always remarkable for an extreme love both for purity and penitence. Her great desire was to be able to consecrate herself to God in the religious state; but her poverty and low birth prevented this. At the age of nineteen, however, she received the habit of the Third Order of S. Dominic, living still in the world. Her life continues at this time to be full of wonderful privileges—such as miraculous communions, and the like—as well as great instances of virtue, especially a great charity for the distressed in body or soul. After a series of severe trials and contradictions, she was admitted as a *secur converse* into a newly-founded convent of Dominicanesses at Langeac, in 1623. She was then twenty-one years of age. Nothing seemed more improbable than her success in obtaining admission, till it was obtained. In the same wonderful way she was promoted to be a choir sister in the following year. She suffered at this time very extraordinary temptations against the vocation to which she had so long aspired: they were so violent and powerful, that it appears as if she would actually have left the convent, but for the sagacity of her Supérieure. The trial ceased at the time of her profession. After a time

we find her in the post of Mistress of Novices ; and the chapter in which an account is given of her exercise of this office is one of singular interest and beauty. She became Supérieure herself in 1626, in the quality of Vicairé only : in the following year she was elected Prioress ; but after occupying the office for more than two years with great prudence and charity, she was exposed to calumnious reports, which prevailed even upon her own religious sisters to petition the Bishop to depose her. This was done in 1630. She was soon, however, cleared from all charges, and regained her former ascendancy over the minds of the inmates of the convent and the world at large ; in 1634 she was again elected Prioress, only, however, to die in the autumn of that year. We have already alluded to her particular office with regard to the saintly founder of S. Sulpice. She received a special injunction in 1631 to pray for him, and continued from that time to exert herself by prayers and penances in his behalf with an ardour and perseverance that could not fail to be rewarded. He attributed his own perfect conversion to her intercession. They were quite unknown to one another : but in a retreat that he was making at Paris, under the guidance of S. Vincent de Paul, the Mère Agnes appeared to him with a crucifix in one hand and a *chapelet* in the other, intimating that the cross and the devotion to our Lady were to be the guides of his life. Even then he remained ignorant whom it was that he had seen ; but after his retreat he returned to the Abbey of Pébrac, which he held *in commendam*, in the neighbourhood of Langeac, and became acquainted with his benefactress. They had frequent conversations together, and he always honoured her as the mother of his soul. His devotion to her has passed, as a sacred inheritance, to his children. The Life which the Abbé Lucot has just republished is the work of a Priest of S. Sulpice. The members of that institution have also been always foremost in the attempts made at various times to procure the beatification and canonization of the Mère Agnes.

The two handsome volumes before us testify abundantly to the honour in which her memory is still held, and to the zeal and industry of their compiler. The original Life by M. Lantages has been supplemented and completed, and copious notes and *pices justificatifs* have been added. Local research has also done its part : every spot that could be connected with the life of Agnes, either at Puy or Langeac, has been carefully catalogued and illustrated. A copious index of matters—a luxury too often looked for in vain in French publications—shows that the loving diligence of the writer has spared itself no pains to make his work complete. It is a noble monument to the memory of Agnes, raised, no doubt, with a view to advance the cause of her beatification. It is somewhat too large for the ordinary readers of Saints' Lives, and might with great profit be abridged for their benefit, as it contains a considerable amount of matter—such as the history of her cause at Rome, and a great number of miracles, not very different from one another in character—with which they could afford to dispense.

The life of Esprit de Jésus is of a bulk more accessible to the class of readers of whom we have just been speaking, and contains just the kind of matter to make it useful as a guide for the Tertiaries of S. Dominic, for whom it is intended. Père Potton does not tell us anything about the author,

M. Jean Dupont, whose works he has edited and corrected. He has, we think, been mistaken in leaving the name "*la Bienheureuse*" on his title-page, notwithstanding an explanatory declaration in smaller type, that nothing more is meant by it than to conform to a usage popular in certain parts. The name "Blessed" should be kept for those whom the Church has beatified. If the cause of *Esprite de Jésus* has ever been so much as introduced, Père Potton does not tell us so. *Esprite Jossaud* was born at Carpentras, in Provence, in 1628, of parents in moderate circumstances. Her piety was remarkable from her earliest years; and the love of purity, leading on to the desire for the religious life, possessed her when quite a child. At twelve she was sent to an Ursuline convent for education: she at once became conspicuous for virtue far beyond her age, and at thirteen made a vow of perpetual chastity. On her applying, however, for leave to become a religious, her mother not only opposed her wish with the utmost violence, but took her at once from the convent. After this time her life was spent at home: all her efforts to become a religious, even after the death of her mother, having proved fruitless. Not long after leaving the convent she became a Tertiary of S. Dominic. She was the example and edification of every one in her native town, the visible Providence of the poor and distressed,—one of the many instances of the most eminent sanctity and the practice of the most sublime virtues in the ordinary paths of life outside the walls of the cloister. It is this that makes her history so admirable a manual for the Tertiaries of S. Dominic, to whom it is dedicated. The book is simply and gracefully written, with little of that technical cast about it which gives a kind of stiffness to many Lives of Saints that have been drawn up upon the foundation of processes of Beatification. Père Potton tells us that almost the only additions he has made consist of a chapter on the history of the Third Order, and some remarks on the devotion of the Rosary. She died in 1658, and began immediately to be held in great veneration at Carpentras; the devotion of the people being frequently rewarded by miracles wrought through her intercession. Her tomb appears to have been profaned during the revolutionary times, and does not now contain any of her relics.

We have to cross the Alps to reach the scene of the third holy life before us. Jane Mary of the Cross—Bernardine Floriani—was born at Roveredo, in the Italian Tyrol, in 1603. Although very pious and pure in her youth, her soul was not entirely conquered to God without many a struggle. For some years, as a girl, she was fond of youthful vanities; and at a later period, after she had had great experience of supernatural favours, she fell back again under the injudicious guidance of an ignorant confessor, who forbade her to make mental prayer, and taught her to distract herself by worldly thoughts whenever she found herself strongly drawn to heavenly emotions. As M. Olier was the fruit of the intercession of Mère Agnes, so she was the child of the prayers and penances of a celebrated Capuchin of that day, Father Thomas of Bergamo, one of the great champions of the Catholic cause in those regions during that terrible crisis. After a long resistance, she yielded entirely to the impulses of grace, made a vow of perpetual chastity, and began to make rapid progress in virtue. In a short time she began to act upon her neighbours, and became the soul and life of good and charitable

works in her native town. She opened a school, which was soon crowded with girls from the best families of the place : she exerted herself to save young women from danger, and to bring them back to virtue when they had fallen from it. No kind of misery but found an assistant in her : she is noted as having shown particular compassion for the poor wretches condemned to death as sorcerers. We find her soon at the head of a pious congregation of ladies, developing with activity and prudence the enormous influences for good of which such associations are capable. By her courage and perseverance she was enabled to establish a similar congregation at Trent. Her great achievement, however, urged upon her and others with particular earnestness by Father Thomas of Bergamo, was the foundation of a convent of Clarisses at Roveredo. Innumerable difficulties had to be surmounted before this establishment could be made ; but in the end she triumphed over them all. The first four or five years of the new convent were strangely disturbed, simply, as it seems, from an injudicious arrangement as to its government. Bernardine and the associates she had assembled to form the new community were Italians. It was necessary, in order to train them in the rule and customs of the Clarisses, that they should have for a time a superior and mistress of novices from another convent ; and the religious sent for this purpose were taken from Brixen, in the Austrian Tyrol. The difference of language, manners, and character between the strangers and their new subjects produced endless trouble, a great share of which fell chiefly upon Bernardine, who was professed under the name by which she was afterwards generally known—Jane Mary of the Cross. The strangers retired to Brixen in 1655, five years after the foundation, and Jane Mary was soon afterwards elected Abbess. After founding another convent at Borgo, she died in 1673.

The line of life that we have thus shortly sketched is neither uncommon nor remarkable among the eminent servants of God. The peculiarity of the life of Jane Mary of the Cross lay in the times in which she was cast, and in the peculiar influence that she exercised upon her neighbourhood and country, even upon several of the most eminent champions of the Catholic cause in the pulpit and in the field. It was the time of the Thirty Years' War. Religion and the faith were in danger everywhere. The king of France was not ashamed to avail himself of the troubles of Germany to aggrandize his own power, even at the expense of assistance to the Protestants. The Turks penetrated through Hungary up to the gates of Vienna itself. Spain was weakened by its Italian possessions and the war of Portugal. The Tyrol was at that time a kind of citadel for Catholicism, and the court of Innspruck its strongest support. Jane Mary was in close and continual communication with many of its members, and her counsels were often followed by generals and statesmen, as well as by preachers and the leaders of the Catholic revival.

It is creditable to a Frenchman to have translated a work which, however incidentally, certainly throws considerable discredit upon the policy of Louis XIV. Jane Mary of the Cross was ardently anti-Gallican, in every sense of the word. On the other hand, she was devoted to the House of Austria, not merely from loyalty, but because it was at that time the bulwark

of the Catholic cause. We have a curious saying of hers as to the mission of that family. The Archduchess Anne of Medici, wife of Ferdinand Charles, Prince of the Tyrol, was one of her intimates, and seems to have expressed to her her sorrow that she had no male issue. "It is not without reason," said Jane, "that so many archduchesses are born in the House of Austria. Its mission is to revive the Catholic religion; and the holy women whom it has furnished have done such important service in this respect, that we must not be surprised if God chooses to multiply such auxiliaries" (p. 427.)

The chapters explaining the relation of Jane Mary to the history of her epoch are, after all, rather obscure, and perhaps, to some extent, injure the work, if it is to be considered simply as the life of a saint. There is also a want of arrangement about the whole. The documents open to the author seem to have been abundant; and perhaps he has let himself be somewhat bewildered in their use. Jane Mary, like the Mère Agnes, has, as we have said, been on her way to the honours of Beatification; but the cause seems to have fallen to the ground upon the measures taken by the Emperor Joseph II. against religious orders, towards the close of the eighteenth century.

M. de Cadoudal's little book on Madame Acarie — better known as the Blessed Mary of the Incarnation — expressly disclaims the character of the Life of a Saint. The author parts from his heroine at the door of the Carmelite convent in which the few last years of her life were spent, after she had been the chief instrument in introducing into France the daughters of S. Teresa. His object is to show her influence upon the society of her time — a stirring time too, as she was the wife of one of the most active members of the League, and was also highly esteemed and trusted by Henri IV. M. de Cadoudal's sketch is graphic, and, as far as its brevity permits, complete; but it lacks details. Moreover, it is both more philosophical and more profitable not to separate what can be known of the interior life of a holy person from its external manifestations and effects upon things around her. We trust that Catholic society has many who in a degree resemble Madame Acarie; but if others are to be taught to be like her, their study must begin from within, where alone can be found the secret of her force and her success.

A Letter on the Management of Schools; addressed to some of the Priests of the Diocese of Southwark. By Rev. J. G. WENHAM, Ecclesiastical Inspector of Schools of the Diocese. London: Burns & Lambert. 1863.

WE should appear hyperbolical if we expressed to the full how admirable this pamphlet appears to us in its own line. It is most refreshing to meet with a work so completely free from pretension, and in which the writer with so much plain simplicity pursues a practical end. Mr. Wenham eschews all theorising on abstract principles, and confines himself to giving some valuable suggestions, founded on his large experience as school manager and school inspector, on the most effective method of training our poor in religious truth.

It must be admitted, we suppose, that the education of the leisured classes is even more important for the Church's best interests than education of the poor, notwithstanding the great inferiority in numbers of the former to the latter class. Unless the leisured classes are both deeply and extensively disciplined in Catholic doctrine and principles, there is serious danger of their unconsciously imbibing a profoundly anti-Catholic spirit. This danger is far more imminent in proportion as their intellectual education in its secular aspect is more effectively and vigorously conducted. And sad experience shows how grievously men of wealth and station, if imbued with such a spirit, can thwart the priest's proper work and impede the sanctification of souls. On the other hand, it is difficult to exaggerate the services which may be rendered to the priesthood by a body of intelligent laymen thoroughly grounded in the principle of submission to the Church. We may fairly say, therefore (putting aside, of course, all reference to *ecclesiastical* education, with which the reviewer, as such, has no concern), that the one most important Catholic work of our time is the religious training of our leisured classes.

But if the education of the poor yields in importance to this one work, it takes precedence surely of every other; and great is the reward which those may expect who devote themselves zealously to its advancement. We have called it one work; but considering the early age at which poor children leave school, we may rather say that it consists, in fact, of two: viz. (1) the well ordering of the Catholic school; and (2) the retaining influence over those who have left school and entered into active life. It would appear, from the testimony of priests well versed in practical matters, that, as yet, this latter work has been much less successfully accomplished than the former, and that the difficulties which it presents are most serious and discouraging; though at the same time, it is certain that various hopeful signs are appearing in the horizon of a brighter future. At all events, the earlier work is absolutely necessary as a foundation for the later; and every improvement in the former renders the latter more easy of accomplishment. And it is entirely to the earlier of these two works that Mr. Wenham directs his present pamphlet.

He begins by asking, "What is meant by a good school?" and he gives the admirable reply, that "it is a place in which children are to be brought under the influence of all possible motives to virtue, and trained to its practice" (p. 5). His next topics are "schoolrooms" and "school management;" and then comes a very important little section on "school discipline:"

"A good school—such as will effect what has at present to be done with our children—is not one in which mere instruction is skilfully conveyed, but one which works upon their forming, but as yet unformed, character, and fixes it for good. But how is this done? In a small—but a very small—degree, by the precepts, the instruction, of the teacher. In a much greater degree, by his example and character; *i. e.*, not by what he says, but what he does. But the great means of influence is the spirit of the school—that is, the tone of feeling and habit of acting that prevails among the mass of children. We all know the almost irresistible influence of the society in which we live. The worst people will be improved by the society of the good. But children's characters are especially open to the influence of others; they are like metals in a state of fusion, still soft and warm, but daily growing more cold and hard, and settling down into a permanent form and character. This form will be

decided by the character of the society into which they fall ; it is the mould of which naturally they must take the shape. The great object, therefore, to be sought for, is that the form or mould may be a good one ; that the influences which the child is under at school may be so powerful for good, as to counteract the evil influences which he is under elsewhere."

Our author next discusses "rules of admission and expulsion," and then enters on the important question of "punishments." Here again occur some invaluable remarks :—

"Besides vice and sin, there are a number of lesser faults which children are continually committing ; faults against order, against cleanliness, against good manners, against the rules of the school—that carelessness, thoughtlessness, inaccuracy, inattention, which may be at the outside venial sins, or may be none, and which yet it is necessary to cure and keep down. How are these to be treated ? If they are punished as sins, the effect is, the child never comes to have a clear notion of what sin is. The broad distinction between such imperfections, and wilful breaches of God's law, is never drawn. The child sees both visited with similar if not equal punishment, and as he observes that all the children fall more or less into such faults, and feels that he cannot avoid it himself, he comes to look upon punishment not as the consequence of his own act, but as either a matter of chance, or dependent on some higher law of which he is at present ignorant. It is then most important to distinguish in our method of treatment between moral faults and mere faults against rule and good order. The latter may be met by different little penances, light in character and involving no degradation, but sufficiently disagreeable in their repetition to stop the mischief, or at least keep it from spreading ; while we should insist on serious punishments, and especially corporal punishment, being reserved for serious and moral offences,—not to be left to junior teachers, nor to be inflicted in the excitement of the moment, nor without due consideration of circumstances, in order to avoid all chance of injustice, and so that the culprit may not be able to draw any other conclusion but that of his own serious delinquency."

We pass over much which is important in the sections on "other means of influence," and on "rewards ;" and come to the remarks on "religious instruction :"—

"The most important points to attend to in religious instruction, are to insure, first, a great interest in the subject. What is related of a certain preacher is in point here. It is said that he asked a celebrated actor how it happened that the latter contrived to obtain the attention and sympathy of his audience while speaking of unrealities, while he, the preacher, though addressing *his* audience on matters of such tremendous reality and consequence to themselves, yet failed to gain their attention. 'Why,' said the actor, 'I speak of fictions as if they were realities, and you speak of realities as if they were fictions.' Now, in truth, religious instruction is *in itself* the most interesting of subjects, from the intimate relation which its truths have to our own life and prospects ; so that if, as often happens, the children show little interest in it, it is because of the dull and unreal way in which it is taught—not as a subject of special concern to themselves, but as so much of 'lessons,' which must be got through like the rest of the day's drudgery.

"The way in which it will be made interesting, is taking care that it is taught simply and easily, so that the children are not called to keep up their attention to what is really above their capacity, but to what is suited to their

powers of comprehension. Another thing which powerfully helps to the interest the children will feel, and which is of extreme importance in itself, is that they should see it treated with reverence, and not as a common subject. I speak with some diffidence, but it seems to me that teachers often make a mistake in aiming at devotion in the children rather than reverence; for to make all people devout is not in our power, and to aim at it is dangerous, as leading, in some cases, to a sort of reaction again religion altogether, and in others to a sort of excitement which is taken for devotion, but which has no solid foundation. But it is a proverb that 'without reverence there is no religion;' and there are no dangers attending the inculcation of this. On the contrary, it is the atmosphere which will still continue to support faith, even when morality is weakened. It is a strong foundation for devotion, and will influence the wild and headstrong when nothing else can turn them. It should then be ceaselessly enforced both by word and example, and it should, and if it exists, must, appear in the manner of giving religious instruction.

"It will help, too, to make religious instruction interesting, if care is taken to bring out the practical character which it really possesses. Some of the things which children learn may never be of any practical use to them apart from serving to cultivate their minds, and it is anyhow difficult or impossible to make the children see what they have to do with them, or why they should care for them. But this is not so in respect to religion, which teaches them truths which intimately concern them—their practice in this life, their prospects for the next. There is no part of religious instruction which does not directly or indirectly bear on some duty. It either teaches us what God requires of us, or supplies us with the motives or the means for fulfilling it. In other things, the children are instructed in what will or may concern them; but in religion it is what does concern them. Hence it is not difficult, and at the same time most important, to give a practical turn to religious instruction: illustrating doctrine by God's actual dealings with us, by what happens in the world, by what the children see done by their superiors, by what they are required to do themselves. The unskilful and unpractical manner in which Catechism is often taught is enough to explain the want of interest shown in it."

We would respectfully submit to the Rev. writer whether there is not something slightly exaggerated in his disparagement of efforts to train children in habits of devotion; but we will not pause to speak further on the matter. On the whole, at all events, nothing can be more reasonable and just than his remarks on the general principles of religious instruction. He then proceeds to consider separately the cases of infants, of younger children not infants, and of older children. On these latter his remarks cannot be too carefully pondered.

"In so many of our schools children are taken away at an early age, that the essential part of religious instruction has to be secured without loss of opportunity. But wherever there are children able to remain to the ages of eleven and upwards, it is very desirable to form from them a third class or division; for not only is it suitable that they should not be contented with a meagre knowledge of necessary things which is perhaps all that is possible with the other children, but *their progress in the knowledge of secular subjects may become a positive harm to them, unless it is accompanied with a corresponding knowledge of religion.* For a taste for reading, and an acquaintance with subjects of history and science and art, brings them within the reach of all those temptations against faith and morality which are so profusely suggested by the literature of the day. To keep back our children from being as well instructed as others is dangerous to attempt, and often impossible

to succeed in. To keep them from the mischievous literature which is brought to their doors is often equally so. The only thing in our power is to arm them as far as possible against the danger by forewarning them of it, and supplying them with strength to repel it. This is most efficiently done, not by making controversialists of them—far from it—but by making them thoroughly acquainted with their own religion. Controversy and the arguments of objectors are apt to weaken the strength of a truth in the child's mind; *clear and positive knowledge more than anything else render him proof against the assaults of heresy or unbelief.*

"This thorough knowledge of their Catechism is a great security to the faith of the children in more ways than one. It is so because many of the arguments or insinuations against religion only arise from ignorance of it; and the answer to many more is very obvious to those who are well instructed. It is indeed instructive to observe how large a proportion of people's difficulties on religion arise from sheer ignorance of it. But it tells in another and more important way. *A single truth may be impugned, and we may be unable, humanly speaking, to withstand the force of the arguments or insinuations made against it; but if this truth is but part of a system connected with and depending on other truths, it is supported by them and by the strength of the entire system. It is easy for an isolated truth to be weakened or disturbed, but not for a body or system of truths.* Hence, in the present day, when children as they grow up are so liable to be exposed to all sorts of dangers, not only to their virtue, but their faith, it is more than ever desirable to give them the additional security of a thorough and ample knowledge of their Catechism, as teaching a system of Christian doctrine. Our upper classes of children may be led to see how one doctrine follows from another; how what the Catechism teaches of God is illustrated by Scripture history; how what it teaches us of man is witnessed in the world and in ourselves. They may get to know the meaning of the feasts and devotions and practices of piety, which they have ever been accustomed to observe, and how they are but exemplifications of the doctrines which are now explained to them. And especially they may be shown the connection between faith and practice, and how what they are called on to do is but a reasonable duty following from that which they believe. In this way Christian doctrine comes to be understood by them to be, not merely a series of difficult and even unpalatable truths, as the world and the devil would lead them to suppose, but a system and body of living and practical truth—a complete explanation, not indeed of mysteries which are above our comprehension, but of all that God sees fit to tell us at present—'all things that appertain to life and piety.'"

Two sections on the "means of maintaining schools" and "school books and furniture," bring to a close this admirable pamphlet which (we cannot doubt) will be most widely beneficial.

Our present circumstances abound with practical difficulties, as every one admits. We think it would be a great blessing if other excellent priests, who have as much practical experience in their respective lines as Mr. Wenham in his, would follow his example, and put into an available and permanent shape the lessons which such experience has taught them.

The Inquiry of a Retired Citizen into the Roman Catholic Religion. Written for the information of all Protestants who desire to know in what particulars the Roman Catholic differs from the Protestant form of Faith; and edited by the Rev. HENRY FORMBY. London: Longman.

THERE are three methods imaginable in which a controversial dialogue may be conducted. Firstly, we may suppose, not only that the opponent is considered to hold certain positive tenets of his own, but also that he is allowed to argue in favour of those tenets with the greatest vigour and adroitness. One of the most striking books conducted on this method is by the old Catholic controversialist Manning, who goes the length of inserting textually the whole of a controversial dialogue written by a Protestant, and intercalating at every step rejoinders to the various replies, so that the Protestant arguments are actually given throughout in the very words of an able advocate.

According to the second imaginable method, the opponent is not allowed indeed to argue very vigorously for his position; but still is treated as having a position of his own; as holding some definite assemblage of positive tenets; as having lived one kind or other of interior life; and as having accumulated some certain body of pious associations round these tenets as a centre. In this kind of controversy, as in the former, the argument is more or less *ad hominem*. The Catholic disputant endeavours to show, *e.g.*, that the difficulties raised by his opponent against Catholicism are no less cogent against his own system; and that the various appearances of good presented by that system, which have recommended it to his acceptance, appertain far more truly to the glorious body of Catholic doctrine.

Mr. Formby's able work belongs to neither of these classes. Not to the first, for Mr. Thomas Goodman is the most obliging of opponents; he recognises at once irrefragable force in every successive argument urged by Mr. Philip Faithful, and misses a thousand opportunities of ingenious cavil, not to say of legitimate and reasonable objection. Nor yet does this work belong to the second class above mentioned; for Mr. Goodman has "not been attached to one form of religion more than another" (p. 3), and his mind accordingly is very much of a *tabula rasa* on the whole subject. Under these circumstances, the form of "conversations" certainly does not possess the peculiar advantages which otherwise belong to it. Still it is in many respects useful, as breaking up the argument into bits, and so enabling the reader to follow it with less fatigue and perplexity. We should add also that in the work before us the various circumstances and adjuncts of the scene are in many respects skilfully devised and picturesquely represented.

In regard to the argument itself, we think Mr. Formby very far more successful in those passages which relate to the broad and visible notes of the Church, than in those which discuss individual doctrines; a result, perhaps, which might have been expected from the doctrinal colourlessness ascribed to Mr. Goodman. We would accordingly recommend, as specially worthy the reader's attention, the second dialogue, called, "The Throne of S. Peter in the City of Rome;" the fifth, called, "The One Apostolic Religion;" and the

eighth, called, "The Perfect Society of the Church of Rome." Throughout these dialogues the Church's irrefragable claims are set forth with the greatest vigour of thought and expression; and the last-named, indeed, which treats on the question of Nationalism, is (so far as we are aware) altogether new and original.

We give an extract, as furnishing a pertinent answer to a common objection:—

"*Thomas.* How do you account, Philip, for the fact of the present Pope having to be maintained in the possession of his city by foreign bayonets?"

"*Philip.* 'Foreign bayonets,' Thomas, is only a phrase which you and others are in the habit of using without at all properly understanding what it is you say. Yet you can hardly be ignorant of the fact, that if you were to go to Pius IX. himself, and if you were to ask him by whom he considered that he was being defended in his city, he would answer you at once, that he considered he was being defended by the bayonets of his right dear sons. And if you were to turn to those who are defending him, and were to ask them, 'Whom do you understand yourselves to be defending?' they would immediately reply in the same manner, 'Our own revered Holy Father.' If, then, it be not honourable for a father to be defended by his own right dear sons, and for the right dear children themselves to defend their father, in what cases is defence ever honourable? And if you ask, Thomas, how it comes to pass that the Pope is able to do what no other man in the wide world can do, viz., to call all people alike, no matter from what nation or country they may come, his 'right dear children,' see if you can give any explanation of his having this power willingly conceded to him, even by his adversaries, except you seek for the cause of it in his being, at least tacitly, acknowledged by all men to be Vicar of Him who died on the cross to redeem all the sons of men, without either the preference or the exclusion of any."

We are particularly grateful to Mr. Formby for the circumstance that, as he does not attempt to conciliate opponents by any concealment of the fulness or stringency of Catholic doctrine, so neither does he attempt to impose upon them by any illusive pictures of unsullied sanctity and peace as existing within the Church. In several places he draws attention to the fact that no immunity has been promised to the Church from most serious practical evils, and that men have no right, therefore, to be surprised or scandalized if such exist. Wherever and to whatever extent they do exist, as he most truly observes, they arise from the failure of individual Catholics to obey the Church's lessons, and conform themselves to her maxims and general spirit.

Stories from the Old Testament. By the Author of "Gospel Stories."
London: Burns & Lambert.

WE consider the object of this little volume an important one, unpretending as is its character. The writer does not profess in these Stories to "give anything like a consecutive history of the Old Testament, or even of the principal facts narrated in it; they have been written with a view to interest children in some of the most striking events contained in sacred Scripture, and, by giving them some little idea of the earlier history of the Jews, and of the dealings of God with His chosen people, to throw a greater

light upon, and give a yet deeper interest to, the Gospel histories." We are not aware that anything precisely of this kind has been attempted; and we strongly recommend the book to the attention of mothers of families, and all who are engaged in the sacred charge of training Christ's little ones. The Church has always set great value upon the study of Holy Scripture. Ill-informed Catholics in this country have, we think, been sometimes too ready to forget this fact, and to talk as if the Church was our *substitute* for the Bible—a most erroneous assertion, if taken to mean that it is quite immaterial whether Catholics are conversant or not with Holy Scripture. By talking in this loose way we concede an advantage to Protestants, or, rather, go far to scandalize them. No doubt the wrong use made of the Written Word of God by those outside the Church, who think to substitute their own private interpretation for her authoritative teaching, has led to the careless expressions which we sometimes hear; but the error is one which we cannot too earnestly deprecate. Next to the Sacraments, the Written Word of God is the great nourisher of piety, and the "manna of the soul," as Father Segneri calls it. The Church has always esteemed it so; and because, as a good *materfamilias*, she insists on dispensing with her own hands this Bread of Life to her children, we must not therefore countenance the idea entertained by Protestants, that she desires to keep it safely under lock and key.

Studied as a mere history of the Jews, the early books of the Bible would, indeed, be of little profit to our children; but read as "testifying of Jesus," they become of inestimable value in extending and deepening the Christian's knowledge and love of his Saviour. We cannot begin too early to lay the foundations of a familiar acquaintance with the Old Testament, and guide our children to a right understanding of its leading facts and its embodied prophecies. As they advance in years, this preliminary knowledge is a stepping-stone to a deeper insight into its mystical meanings, so profitable for making progress in the interior life.

Too much has not been attempted in these little Stories, which are designed for young children. The work is intended to be a companion to the "Gospel Story-Book," by the same author, who observes that the fact of its being, perhaps, less strictly childlike in its language, has been "thought by some, even very young auditors, to be an improvement." We think the writer has been judicious in acting upon the experience thus obtained. Children take no particular pleasure in being addressed as children, so long as what they read is put in a form to interest them. Even an occasional hard word is far from objectionable, if complicated and involved sentences are avoided.

The Church Establishment in Ireland : Past and Present. Illustrated exclusively by Protestant authorities ; with Appendices showing the Revenues of the Established Church, the Religious Census of the Population of Ireland, and other Returns bearing on this subject. Dublin : Warren. 1863.

THE title of this pamphlet sufficiently explains its subject, which is one of paramount importance, not only to Irishmen and Catholics, but to all who have the interest of our common country at heart. Nothing can be more opportune than its appearance, because nothing can be more pressing than the necessity of applying a remedy to this old festering wrong of Ireland, a wrong which adds its special sting to her other crying grievance—the evil system of land-tenure. As the subject is its own recommendation, we shall content ourselves with noticing that the passages selected for quotation from Protestant authorities display a judgment and a skill in the compiler which the able preface from his own pen would have led us to anticipate. We want more of such advocates—men who have the zeal of thoroughgoers without that bitterness and exaggeration which are its not unfrequent accompaniment ; who exhibit the dispassionateness and calmness of true moderation without that marring defect to which the so-called moderate are subject—a certain want of clear perception, and frank uncompromising election, of the right side.

Right is right, and wrong is wrong ; and truth is not a mean any more than it is an extreme. Truth has been termed a mean, because extremes, which, in fact, are errors, cluster round it on all sides, leaning upon it, as all error must, in order to have an intelligible basis for support ; but in itself it is positive, it is central ; it is not a matter of equilibrium or balance, a little here and a little there to keep the scales even. We often hear Protestants who are too reasonable not to perceive, and too candid not to acknowledge, the social grievances of Ireland and her past misgovernment, speak of “ faults on both sides.” It is a palliative to which they naturally have recourse. But many Catholics also, from the very spirit to which we have just alluded, which is generally accompanied, if not always allied, with the fear of asserting too strongly what will be offensive to the opposing party, will also repeat the same trite phrase. There is a sense, of course, in which it is perfectly true to say that there are generally faults on both sides. Where nations, or any collective number of people, are concerned, it would be a marvel indeed if the aggrieved party were invariably blameless in their conduct. Rarely is this the case even in private dissensions between man and man ; for we are faulty creatures, and, even when in the right, we commit secondary faults—often very great ones. How frequently these go so far as to obscure the original merits of the question, every one’s experience must attest. Nay, sometimes the injured party will commit more secondary faults, or such as are more palpable, than the aggressor : he loses his temper, for instance—he commits himself, as we are wont to say. Still it remains equally true that, in the main point, right is on one side, wrong on the other.

“ ‘They are past, the old days ;—let the past be forgotten :
 Let them die, the old wrongs and old woes that were ours,
 Like the leaves of the winter, down-trampled and rotten,
 That light in the spring-time the forest with flowers.’

“ ‘Well sing’st thou, sweet voice ! But the sad voice replieth,
 ‘Unstaunch’d is the wound while the insult remains ;
 The Tudor’s black banner above us still flieth ;
 The faith of our fathers is scorn’d in their fanes !

“ ‘Distrust the repentance that clings to its booty ;
 Give the people their Church, and the priesthood its right :—
 Till then to remember the past is a duty,
 For the past is our Cause, and our Cause is our might.’ ”*

In the case of the Established Church of Ireland, a Church which numbers in her fold but one-ninth of the whole population, there can be no question on which side is the right and on which side the wrong ; and many Protestants have been forward to confess the injustice as well as the inexpediency of maintaining Protestant ascendancy in that Catholic country. But the amount of testimony which has been here brought together on the subject—the more striking when the eminence and variety of the witnesses are considered—will, we believe, surprise not a few.

The pamphlet will, we trust, find its way, as it deserves, into still more general circulation. The extracts ought to prove interesting, as the compiler observes, to three classes of persons. “ To the statesman they recall those moral and political principles by a firm allegiance to which the security of the empire can alone be placed on a permanent basis. To the Protestant gentleman of Ireland they show how ignobly his own order must share in the national weakness produced by sectarian partiality. To the Catholic of every class—the peer and the peasant—they prove that his duty to his religion is identified with his duty to his country, and with the stability of the empire.”

Narrative of a Secret Mission to the Danish Islands in 1808. By the Rev JAMES ROBERTSON. Edited from the Author’s MS. by his Nephew, ALEXANDER CLINTON FRAZER. London : Longmans. 1863.

MOST of our readers will learn with surprise that the hero of the curious episode of the great European war which is detailed in this volume was not only a Catholic priest, but a monk of the Benedictine order, and had been for some time a professor in the great ecclesiastical college of Maynooth. His name may, perhaps, be remembered—and if remembered at all, it will be so with much interest—by a few of the older clergy of Dublin, where he was known for a time after his return from this mission by the soubriquet of “Romana Robertson ;” but members of the new school, trained up in the stricter notions of inmodern clerical life, will be startled by the idea of a priest voluntarily engaging in what may almost be called military service, on behalf of a Protestant government, and especially in a service which involved

* Aubrey de Vere.

no small amount of those arts of disguise and of that false assumption of character and false representation of facts, which, however recognized among the conventional necessities of war, cannot but be regarded as involving very questionable principles of morality.

It is difficult at this distance of time, and in the present altered condition of the world, to carry the mind back to the realities of the period to which this narrative refers. In the complete disruption of society which attended the French Revolution, and the utter destruction of the ecclesiastical establishments, not alone of France, but of almost all the continent of Europe, ecclesiastics of the highest name and of the holiest life were driven to strange shifts in order to obtain the means of even that humble livelihood with which their simple and self-denying habits enabled them to be content; and a curious and deeply interesting narrative might even still be compiled from the recollections of the few survivors who have outlived the vicissitudes of the half century which separates us from the wars of the French Revolution. It is in the spirit which such recollections alone can evoke that Father Robertson's secret mission must be read in order to be appreciated, or even understood.

At the time when Spain, goaded into resistance by the long course of treachery and outrage of which, through the intrigues or the violence of the Emperor Napoleon, she had been made the dupe or the victim, rose in one united effort against the French usurper, a large body of Spanish troops was stationed in the north of Europe, where it formed part of the so-called army of observation under Bernadotte. There cannot be a doubt that the withdrawal of these troops, the *élite* of the Spanish army, from the Peninsula at a crisis so important, was a part of the Emperor's profound and long-prepared scheme for the establishment of a Bonapartist kingdom in Spain. He had compelled the consent of the weak though designing Godoy to a measure to the peril of which that unscrupulous minister was fully alive; and, while the natural defenders of their country were at a distance, having by the arrest of the royal family, the seizure of the frontier fortresses, and the forced abdication of the King, prepared the way for the proclamation of his, brother Joseph Bonaparte, he contrived, by the control which he exercised over all the channels of intelligence, to keep the soldiers, and even their officers, as well as the general himself, the Marquis de Romana, in utter ignorance of the events which had taken place in the Peninsula. The British Government, on receiving intelligence of the rising against Joseph Bonaparte in Spain, resolved to second the efforts of the Spanish people for the recovery of their independence; and it was at once determined that an effort should be made at all risks to withdraw this important body of troops from the French service and the French alliance, in the confidence that, once returned to their native land, they would range themselves on the side of their country and their religion. Several attempts, accordingly, were made to open communication with Romana, all of which failed, and in some instances with the sacrifice of the life of the agents who had been employed. It was after these repeated failures that Father Robertson was selected for the perilous but important enterprise of opening communication with the Marquis de Romana.

Father James Robertson was a native of Scotland, and had been a member of the well-known and meritorious Scottish Benedictine community at Ratisbon, where he had formed the acquaintance and attracted the favourable regard of the Duke of Richmond. When this nobleman came to Ireland as Lord-Lieutenant, he gladly renewed his acquaintance with Father Robertson, who was then resident in Dublin and had for a time held a lectureship in St. Patrick's College at Maynooth, and recommended him to the notice of the Chief Secretary, Sir Arthur Wellesley. On the appointment of the latter to the command in Spain, he at once fixed on Father Robertson as specially suited, by his religion and determination of character, and his perfect familiarity with Germany and the German language, for the perilous expedition into Northern Germany, which had failed in all other hands. Father Robertson, in whose eyes, as in those of most ecclesiastics at the time, the cause of Spanish independence was the cause of religion, even more than of national liberty, accepted the office without hesitation; and the little volume now first published is his own narration of his successful mission. It is exceedingly curious, although it is necessary to call up a certain amount of the spirit of the time and of the cause, in order to reconcile oneself to the *suppressio veri*, if not the *suggestio falsi*, in which the enterprise by its very nature repeatedly involved him.

We must refer to the volume itself for details. It will be enough to say that he made his way in the assumed character of a foreigner to Heligoland, whence he succeeded by the aid of a smuggler in being put ashore in the mouth of the Weser, and reached Bremen in safety. There, having procured the baptismal certificate of a German friend, from the Palatinate of Bavaria, he took out a passport in his name, for which he secured the necessary *visés*; and, providing himself with a stock of chocolate and choice cigars, he made his way, by Hamburg and Lübeck to Kiel. Within a short distance of this port he hired a fishing-boat, by which he was landed in the small island of Assens, and thence proceeded by a similar conveyance to Fünen, where Romana was quartered. Feeling that his best hope of success lay in the assumption of a bold indifference, he actually took up his quarters, in his commercial capacity, in the very hotel which was occupied by General Romana and his staff; and with exceeding caution and dexterity succeeded (although he was entirely unprovided with written credentials, and was obliged to rely altogether on a memento of former acquaintance with General Romana which the Foreign Office had furnished to him) not only in opening a communication with Romana, but in inducing him to accept the offer of the British Government to place the fleet at his disposal for the conveyance of the Spanish army to the Peninsula. The embarkation of the troops, to the number of nearly 10,000, was dexterously effected by Romana; only 300 of the entire body remaining as prisoners of war in the hands of Bernadotte.

We can only find room for a single incident which occurred in Father Robertson's effort to procure a passport at Lübeck, and in which we must confess that he appears to have indeed merged the priestly character in that of the secret agent. He had already obtained the certificate of baptism as related above:—

"The following day I prevailed on the merchant's clerk to apply for a passport at the Town House, as if for a friend who had come from the country on his way to Hamburgh. This was granted without difficulty ; but it was necessary that I should make my appearance and sign my name ; and such is the force of habit that I began with the initial letter of my real name J, which the town-clerk observing, suddenly called out to me, 'How, sir ! did not you tell me that your name was Adam ?' It was really an unpardonable blunder, and might have proved fatal but for one of the luckiest thoughts that ever occurred to me in a moment of difficulty. 'Sir,' I replied (and certainly with some embarrassment), 'in the Palatinate of Bavaria, in which I was born, we are in the habit of prefixing Johann (John) to every man's baptismal name, as we do Mary to every woman's ; so that we do not say George, Peter, Adam, &c., but Hans (the familiar appellative of John) George, Hans Peter, or Hans Adam.' This is really the case. The explanation wore the air of truth, and saved me for the time."—Pp. 30-32.

Father Robertson, having accomplished his mission, remained abroad until he had reason to hope that the vigilance of the police authorities had somewhat relaxed, and returned to Ireland in safety in the following year. He went back to his convent at Ratisbon in 1815 ; and, with the exception of a short visit to Scotland in 1818, resided there till his death in 1820.

Mémoires de la Cour d'Espagne sous le Règne de Charles II. (1678—1682).

Par le MARQUIS DE VILLARS. Being a collation of the various editions and manuscripts of these Memoirs now known to exist, with some Inquiry as to their alleged Author. A paper read before the Royal Irish Academy, Monday, Dec. 8, 1862. By DENIS FLORENCE MACCARTHY, M.R.I.A. Dublin : University Press. 1863.

THE episode in bibliographical history detailed in this paper forms a "curiosity of literature" so very remarkable, that we shall condense the facts for the instruction or amusement of those among our readers who have been tempted into the seductive, although too often unprofitable, domains of bibliography.

Mr. Stirling, the well-known writer on Spanish art, being requested to contribute something to one of the miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society, was induced to print for that Society, in 1861, a MS. volume, entitled, "*Mémoires de Villars*," which he had bought for a few shillings at a sale at Sotheby's about ten years previously, and which, after most careful examination and repeated consultations with his literary friends, he concluded had never before been published. The steps by which Mr. Stirling was led to this conclusion are among the most remarkable incidents of the story. He had searched in vain in Brunet, in Quérard, in the "*Biographie Universelle*," and in both editions of the Marquis de Villars' "*Lettres*." He had examined MSS. in the British Museum. He had exhibited the book at several meetings of the Philobiblon Society, and had consulted several of his friends, those especially who were most familiar with the *Mémoires* department of French literature. Sir Frederic Madden had pronounced it as his opinion that the MS. had never been printed. Mr. Stirling had

referred with the same ill-success to the library of Mr. Ford, author of the "Handbook of Spain," had repeatedly consulted with Mr. Ford himself, and, acting under his advice, had addressed a letter to the readers of "Notes and Queries," asking for information as to his unknown MS. Failing all these inquiries, he had, not altogether unreasonably, concluded that the MS. was unpublished, and accordingly had sent it to press.

On Mr. Stirling's volume coming, soon after publication, into the hands of Mr. D. F. MacCarthy, the latter was struck by its general resemblance to a book in his own possession, entitled "*Mémoires de la Cour d'Espagne depuis l'année 1679, jusqu'en 1681; Paris, 1733.*" And on a comparison of the two he found, to his infinite surprise, that the two books were literally identical! But what is still more curious, Mr. MacCarthy had purchased this volume at the sale of Mr. Ford, who was one of Mr. Stirling's authorities for the book being unpublished, and who, as appeared from numerous pencil marks, marginal notes, and an observation on the fly-leaf, had read the volume carefully, and had made some conjectures as to its origin and author. Nay, among the sources to which Mr. Stirling had referred for information had been this very library of Mr. Ford, with every book of which he had believed himself acquainted; and, to complete the strange climax of literary blunders and oversights, there is actually printed in his own delightful work on the Artists of Spain, a reference to the very volume which Mr. MacCarthy now identifies as the original of the Philobiblon MS., and to its supposed resemblance to Madame d'Aulnoy's "*Mémoires de la Cour d'Espagne!*"

The particulars of this curious affair are detailed with much vivacity, and with many interesting collateral illustrations, in Mr. MacCarthy's paper. It has furnished no little amusement in bibliographical circles both at home and on the Continent.

A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London. With Selections from his Correspondence. Edited by his Son, ALFRED BLOMFIELD, M.A. 2 vols. London: Murray.

WE notice this work for the purpose of drawing the attention of Catholics to some striking comments on the character and career of Dr. Blomfield, which appeared in the *Reader*, a new Protestant literary journal, No. 17. They exhibit a high and Catholic tone of thought, which, in a Protestant writer, is very remarkable. We may add that the criticism appears to us most just.

"A smoother career no man of eminence ever had who, with a strong character of his own, was called to govern in times of conflict. He used to say as a child that he intended to be a bishop, and a bishop he was certainly fitted to become, both by his excellences and defects. Without even a vestige of that peculiar temperament which strains passionately after Truth, without speculative ardour, without imaginative power, Dr. Blomfield possessed every practical quality which a mere administrator of the Church should boast—soundness of practical judgment, alacrity of purpose, vigilance of eye, clearness of thought and fluency of speech, considerable benevolence, great ambition, an inborn respect for formula, and no meditateness of dis-

position. These were just the qualities which best fitted an ecclesiastical leader for ascendancy at the time when the late Bishop of London rose to eminence ; and they enabled him to glide along the stream of ecclesiastical preferment with as much ease as dignity. . . . He was an honest, liberal, clear-sighted, and able man of the world, with sufficient tincture of formulated piety to make a good ruler in the Church ; but, as for any of the impulses which have impelled men 'to leave all and follow Christ,' he probably understood no more of them than he did of that passionate pursuit of Truth of which we have spoken. He loved power, and used it well ; he loved order, and introduced it wherever he went ; he loved learning, and turned it to good account ; he loved decorum both of the outward and inward man, but assuredly he was never consumed by any of the higher religious passions, and always presented the dignified spectacle of a clever statesman transmuted by a superficially modified education into an ecclesiastic of eloquence and tact, who understood the civilizing duties of a rich national establishment, and the humanizing power of a seemly religion, much better than he understood that 'Word of God which is sharp and powerful as any two-edged sword to the dividing asunder of soul and flesh.' Bishop Blomfield was one of those men whose powers are eminently useful to the Church, but who make one wonder more than ever how the Christian Church rooted itself in the earth. Christianity, bleeding and in rags, is not quite inconsistent with the notion of some of our greater and even titled divines. We can imagine Bishop Butler painfully pondering its announcements, and slowly fixing upon it the grave eager eye of his insatiable spiritual nature till he would have thrown down everything else to press either the thorns or the cross to his heart ; we can conceive Bishop Berkeley with swifter and happier enthusiasm welcoming the same sacrifice ; but we cannot conceive that Bishop Blomfield would ever have been one of these. His virtues, though great, are all of the salutary civil class. He is, as his son calls him, *vir pietate gravis*, whose piety increases his social influence, and is thought of chiefly in that light ; but it is much easier to think of him without his piety than without his social influence. He would assuredly have been shocked by the dreaminess and enthusiasm of the primitive Christianity, would have thought S. Paul flighty, and S. John *exalté*, and the whole proceedings of the early Church a very regrettable inroad on the natural influence of wealth and learning."

The Water-Babies: a Fairy Tale for a Land-Baby. By the Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY. London and Cambridge : Macmillan & Co.

AS a "Fairy Tale for a Land-Baby," this work is certainly described very absurdly by its author ; for the greater part of it consists of a farrago of crude ideas and jesting allusions, either to science or the economy of human life, which could neither be understood by children, nor afford them the amusement they often receive from that which they but imperfectly comprehend. This applies to the bulk of the volume, for the introductory part is pleasantly written as a story, but passes off disagreeably and unartistically into an allegory of a clumsy description, treated with great prolixity, and in a manner that gives one the impression that the writer thinks himself extremely clever for throwing out a succession of fancies, the darlings of his own mind, but which others may not equally appreciate. But we must endeavour to give the reader a general notion of the plan of this fairy-tale.

It begins with the story of a little chimney-sweep, Tom, who is brought by his hard master, Grimes, to sweep the chimneys of a great country-house. Whilst engaged in this occupation, he makes a wrong descent, and enters the chamber where the beautiful little daughter of the hall is lying asleep. She wakes in a fright, and the poor little sweep makes his escape up the chimney and over the roof, pursued by the household, whom the cries of the little lady alarm. He runs across a moor, clammers down a crag (well described), and is sheltered by the old mistress of a dame-school in a hay-loft. But waking up after some rest, he strays to wash himself in a stream, falls in, and is drowned. Then begins the allegorical part of the story. Tom becomes forthwith a "water-baby;" for it appears that, in Mr. Kingsley's imaginations, there is a new world under the waves, for infants—

"Quos dulcis vitæ exsortes et ab ubere raptos
Abstulit atra dies."

It would be useless to analyse what is written in so vague and rambling a manner as most of what follows. It resembles, on a larger scale, a little German tale some of our readers may remember—"The Story without an End." Tom makes acquaintance with caddises and dragon-flies, lobsters and salmon, sea-anemones, sea-snails, and the other wonders beneath the waves. And he goes through a sort of probation with other little water-babies in S. Brandan's Isle, under the care of two fairies, one ugly and the other beautiful, called Mrs. Be-done-by-as-you-did and Mrs. Do-as-you-would-be-done-by, representing respectively the punishments of bad, and the rewards of conscientious, that is to say, principally of kind, actions. Meanwhile, Ellie, the little girl whom he had seen in his terrestrial existence asleep in the country-house, has died from a fall, that is, flown away on a pretty pair of fairy wings, and meets Tom in the sub-aqueous regions. Presently afterwards, the writer, apparently conscious that his allegory is weak, sends Tom off "to see the world," and he goes upon a long voyage of discovery to the "Other-end-of-nowhere," when he visits such countries as the Island of Polupragmosyne, the Land of Hearsay, the Isle of Tom-toddies (Laputa, borrowed from Captain Gulliver), and Old-wives-fabledom, ending by finding his old master Grimes, apparently in a model-prison, and finishing his own education by bringing that gentleman to a better frame of mind. Here and there (as some of these names will indicate) we observe a trace of the study of Rabelais, enough to give a sort of colour to the parable. And, to speak chemically, we may notice also the presence of the "Pilgrim's Progress" and of Southey's "Doctor." Mr. Kingsley has not failed here and there to aim a bird-bolt at the Catholic Church, showing bitter animosity under the veil of jesting. Thus his childish readers will learn to regard "monks and popes," together with famines, wars, measles, and quacks, as children of self-will, ignorance, fear, and dirt. These are things which some Protestants think us very touchy if we object to, in a finely-printed volume, rich with green and gold. They only show how all-penetrating is the atmosphere of anti-Catholic feeling which reigns in English literature.

A Treatise on the True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin. By the Venerable Servant of God, LOUIS-MARIE GRIGNON DE MONTFORT. Translated from the original French by FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, D.D., Priest of the Oratory. London: Burns & Lambert.

IT is impossible to notice this little volume without adverting to the circumstance that it is doubtful whether Father Faber will be still alive when these lines meet the reader's eye. It will be remarkable, indeed, if the last literary effort of one so singularly gifted with original power shall have been the humble work of translating, with scrupulously accurate fidelity, the treatise of another. It will be the worthy end of a life which has been animated throughout with most unusual simplicity of purpose by one prevailing motive—a self-abnegating zeal for the promotion of God's glory.

As to the treatise itself, it appears to us in many respects so singularly important, that we hope before long to treat it most carefully in a separate article. It may be questioned, indeed, whether the saintly author has not somewhat exaggerated the degree of divergence which exists between the special devotion to our Lady which he recommends, and that more ordinarily practised among Catholics. But so far as such divergence exists, it is the speciality of the Venerable Grignon's method to unite two characteristics which Protestants will persist in regarding as mutually contradictory. The devotion which he specially recommends will lead us, on the one hand, in quite a singular degree to interweave the remembrance of our Blessed Lady with every detail of our interior life; while, on the other hand, it will lead us in quite as singular a degree to make that remembrance ministrative to the unceasing thought of her Divine Son.

We will annex one remarkable extract in testimony against another Protestant misconception. Protestants commonly think that those who give extreme prominence to our Blessed Lady are on that very account disposed to tamper with the uncompromising strictness of Christian morality. Let them listen to the words of one who has certainly never been exceeded—who has probably never been equalled—in the prominence which he gives to Marian devotion:—

“*Presumptuous* devotees are sinners abandoned to their passions, or lovers of the world, who, under the fair name of Christians and clients of our Blessed Lady, conceal pride, avarice, impurity, drunkenness, anger, swearing, detraction, injustice, or some other sin. They sleep in peace in the midst of their bad habits, without doing any violence to themselves to correct their faults, under the pretext that they are devout to the Blessed Virgin. They promise themselves that God will pardon them; that they will not be allowed to die without confession; and that they will not be lost eternally, because they say the Rosary, because they fast on Saturdays, because they belong to the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary, or wear the scapular, or are enrolled in other congregations, or wear the little habit or little chain of our Lady. They will not believe us when we tell them that their devotion is only an illusion of the devil, and a pernicious presumption likely to destroy their souls. They say that God is good and merciful; that He has not made us to condemn us everlastingly; that no man is without sin; that they shall not die without confession; that one good Peccavi at the hour of death is

enough ; that they are devout to our Lady ; that they wear the scapular ; and that they say daily, without reproach or vanity, seven Paters and Aves in her honour ; and that they sometimes say the Rosary and the Office of our Lady, besides fasting, and other things. To give authority to all this, and to blind themselves still further, they quote certain stories, which they have heard or read—it does not matter to them whether they be true or false,—relating how people have died in mortal sin without confession ; and then, because in their lifetime they sometimes said some prayers, or went through some practices of devotion to our Lady, how they have been raised to life again, in order to go to confession, or their soul been miraculously retained in their bodies till confession ; or how they have obtained from God at the moment of death contrition and pardon of their sins, and so have been saved ; and that they themselves expect similar favours. *Nothing in Christianity is more detestable than this diabolical presumption.* For how can we say truly that we love and honour our Blessed Lady, when by our sins we are pitilessly piercing, wounding, crucifying, and outraging Jesus Christ her Son ? If Mary laid down a law to herself, to save by her mercy this sort of people, she would be authorising crime, and assisting to crucify and outrage her Son."

Brevi Cenni intorno alla Vita e gli Scritti di Francesca de Maistre, con alcune Memorie di Benedetta Medolago Albani, nata De Maistre. Roma: coi Tipi della Civiltà Cattolica.

WE have not ourselves had the opportunity of seeing this little volume, mentioned in the "Review of the Press," in the last number of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, but we are led to notice it in connection with an article appearing in the pages of the present REVIEW upon the life and writings of Rosa Ferrucci. These two sisters, who, from the name, would seem to be of French extraction, offered to the world a kindred example. Our reviewers compare the book containing the portrait of their sweet lives to a beautiful nosegay of many-tinted flowers—a remark which forcibly recalls to us our own feelings when we first became acquainted with that sweet flower of Northern Italy who has unconsciously revealed herself in unaffected outpourings of her own pen. What gives a singular value to these mystical flowers of virtue, our writers observe, is the nature of the place where they have flourished, which was not some solitary cloister, but in the midst of the world and the comforts and luxuries of a rich and noble family. Their sanctity was exhibited, not in any outward singularity, but in the most diligent attention to profit by every little occasion of merit, and by an extraordinary excellence in the most ordinary acts. Francesca arrived at a very high perfection, and took the three vows of religion in the world. To a sound Catholic education she must have been greatly indebted, as by nature she had dispositions which, under less propitious training, might have led to the formation of a very different character. We are told that she was by nature of a lively disposition, with a precocious understanding, an ardent heart, a tenacious attachment to her own opinion, and a want of moderation in her inclinations which disposed her towards exaggeration and singularity in her actions, and which might easily have passed into the eccentric. What abundant materials existed here for the formation of an indocile character ! What a hotbed for the fostering

of the passions ! The discipline of Christian mortification, however, which she early learnt and perseveringly applied to all the minutæ of daily life, not only got the better of these natural defects, but turned all the strength and ardour of a mind which might have been so energetic for evil, to the practice of the most heroic virtue.

What is wanted is a more vigorous Christianity in our family training ; and how fruitful the results might be, such specimens may serve to show. If our education lack the gentle sternness of Christ's school, we must expect to reap an abundant harvest of superficiality, vanity, delicate self-indulgence, caprice, impertinence, and unreflecting worldliness, that desolator of all that is good or loving in the heart.

"A New Series of Hymns and Sacred Part-Songs, for One, Two, Three, or Four Voices, with Accompaniment,"—the music chiefly by living composers, edited by Frederick Westlake, A.R.A.M. (London : Lambert & Co., 17, Portman-street)—is an attempt, and we think a very successful one, to apply the resources of modern musical art to the illustration of devotional poetry, and thus to furnish what has hitherto been a desideratum in Catholic circles. The words are for the most part selected from the hymns and poems of Fathers Faber and Caswall, with a few miscellaneous pieces from Aubrey de Vere, Miss Procter, and other poets, and one or two prose verses from the Psalms. The music is of two different kinds. The first and main portion of each number consists of Catholic hymns of a comparatively simple character, for one or more voices ; while another is made up of longer pieces, intended apparently to occupy in sacred music a similar field to that which has been so well cultivated by Mendelssohn and others in their secular part-songs, &c. This latter portion will be an especial boon to our schools, colleges, and choral societies, as well as to Catholic families generally. As to the character of the music, it may well be left to speak for itself. Suffice it to say that the editor has been fortunate enough to secure the assistance of such musicians as Molique, Silas, Macfarren, Schulthes, Barnett, Fagan, Lutz, and others, and that one and all have done their best. We are glad to see that, besides the miscellaneous hymns which the present parts contain, the plan comprises also a complete series of Hymns and Part-songs for the feasts of Our Lady and of the chief Saints of the Church. We may have occasion hereafter to treat more at length the subject of English Catholic Hymnology. Meantime, the work before us has our best wishes for its successful progress. We may add that it is extremely cheap.

We have received a translation from the Italian of Father Croiset's work on *"Devotion to the Sacred Heart."* English books on this devotion are by no means so numerous as might have been expected from its singularly touching character. Every nation has its own defects, and the English are not so easily attracted as foreigners to *tenderness* of devotion. Precisely for this reason we hail with pleasure every new effort calculated to imbue them

with devotion to the Sacred Heart, tenderness being its one distinguishing characteristic. The work before us is most thoughtful and solid; filled with fervent affectionateness, while completely free from anything which could be deemed extravagant or fanatical. We most cordially recommend it.

We have been greatly interested in receiving the successive numbers of *The Lamp*. This unpretending periodical is doing a very important Catholic work; its contents are admirably adapted to the proposed end, and are often conspicuous for ability; while its general tone, so far as we have observed, is everything which could be desired.

Mr. Marshall has put forth a new edition of his most useful and elaborate work on Christian Missions; nor is his new edition a mere reprint of the former, but, on the contrary, contains many substantial improvements. The whole question which he raises, and indeed the whole subject of foreign missions, is one to which we would earnestly solicit the attention of English Catholics. At a very early period, therefore—most probably in our next number,—we shall take occasion to enlarge on those topics which Mr. Marshall's volumes so irresistibly suggest.

We see announced a work on the Holy House of Loreto, written by the late Father Hutchison in answer to Professor Stanley, of Oxford University. Monsignore Bartolini has also written an interesting work on the same theme. We hope, when Father Hutchison's work appears, to place before our readers a conspectus of the whole controversy.

FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

La Civiltà Cattolica. Serie V., Vols. V. VI. Roma, 1863.

THE rich periodical literature of our time exercises one very important office—that of keeping those who have not leisure for extensive reading *au courant* of the critical questions of the day, and placing before them in a condensed and easily accessible shape the attained results of thought and study. But it has become so voluminous, that it requires to have something of the same office performed in its behalf, as it performs for the literary world at large. To supply this want in a measure, as respects subjects of general Catholic interest, we purpose from time to time to give an analysis of the more important papers that appear in the pages of foreign periodicals, among which the *Civiltà Cattolica* deservedly holds a prominent place.

The January numbers contain two interesting papers on the Temporal Power of the Popes. They are a continuation of a series of articles thrown

into the form of conversations. Three friends meet and discuss the subject. There is the advocate of the Catholic cause, the opponent imbued with the liberalism of the day, and a Neapolitan stranger desirous of fuller information, but whose sympathies are on the Catholic side. This mode of conducting an argument has its advantages ; but it commonly errs by showing undue favour to its own side, making the automaton opponent cut his own throat, or rather that of the cause he espouses, in the most accommodating fashion ; thus merely helping to show off the prowess of his adversary before becoming an easy conquest. The writers of the conversations before us are not chargeable with this defect. They allow the adversary to state his case fully and strongly, and, as yet, it must be added, he shows no signs of conversion.

In the first number of the present year the position assumed is, that the attack on the Temporal Power is really an attack on civil liberty. As a preliminary step towards proving this point, the advocate calls attention to the fact that the attack on the temporal power of the Pope is but a particular form of the war which the world has ever waged against the Church ; which war, although really directed to the uprooting of the Church, can succeed only in despoiling it of all liberty of public and social action. That the attack in question has this largeness of scope, is evident both from the ferocity with which it is urged—a ferocity inexplicable from the mere fact of the Holy Father's temporal power forming an obstacle to Italian unity, since the heretics and revolutionists of all countries assail it with a like vehemence—and from the energy with which bishops, clergy, religious orders, and the Catholic laity generally, have declared themselves in favour of its maintenance. It is an instinct of self-preservation which has produced this almost unexampled unanimity. The Catholic world feels it is fighting *pro aris et focis*, for the palladium of ecclesiastical liberty. The necessity of the Pope's possessing an independent territory is all the more evident in the present day, now that particular Churches have lost their independent social action, through the progress of so-called liberal institutions. These local Churches have properly neither legal rights nor public action, save according to the good pleasure of the respective governments. Under these circumstances, their last and only support is the Holy See. To rob the Supreme Head of the Church of his temporal sovereignty, and thereby cripple his freedom and independence, would consequently be equivalent to reducing all particular Churches to slavery.

But in the liberty of the Church, civil liberty is itself implicated. The Catholic advocate shows that the true action of liberty was unknown before the establishment of Christianity. The problem of reconciling in each individual the dignity of the reasonable creature with the necessity of social dependence for the maintenance of order, is solved only by the submission of all to one Sovereign Ruler, which can be God alone. Hence the necessity of a spiritual power, the depository and interpreter of the oracles of God. The Catholic Church has provided the faithful with a treasure of speculative and practical truths, independent of the civil power ; and in the Sovereign Pontiff proposes a living, present, and universal master for the teaching, preservation, and interpretation of these truths. Moreover, as faith teaches

that the powers of this world are constituted by God, the opprobrium of man's submission to his fellow man is thus removed : add to which, the civil power, whether wielded by an individual or by an assembly of men professing Christianity, could not arrogate to itself any authority in matters of conscience. As Christians, they would be themselves subject, in spiritual things, to the same authority ; and, as Christians, it would be their duty to procure the highest good of their subjects, and protect the Church in the exercise of her rights over conscience. Such is the true ideal of liberty introduced by the Church, avowed, acted upon, and, in a measure, carried out, previously to the introduction of modern theories of freedom.

The adversary objects :—Why, if this be so perfect a system, has one nation after another become intolerant of it, and sought to substitute the modern constitutional principles inaugurated in '89 ? [By modern constitutionalism, as the contest shows, the writers understand the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people as held by modern democrats, who maintain, not only that sovereignty is derived from the people, in the sense of their having the original inherent right to choose their governor and their form of government, but that this sovereignty is their immutable possession, and is exercised by the governing power simply as their organ : the ruler being the incarnation, so to say, of the sovereign will of the people—or rather of the majority of the people ; and, as he rules by their will, so may they at any time remove him at their pleasure. The two opposite poles of this system are despotism and revolution. It is needless to observe that our English notions of constitutionalism differ widely from those rife amongst continental liberals, and it is an unfortunate blunder, too common in this country, to confound the two ideas.]

The advocate replies that this work is not to be attributed to the people, except so far as they have been used as instruments ; rather they have everywhere been against the victims. The revolt to the spiritual power originated with the secular rulers. The pride which finds its highest gratification in political dominion could not endure that the noblest portion of man should escape from its rule, leaving it only the body to govern. Hence the desire of princes and governors to restrain, cripple, and, if possible, enslave the spiritual power—the great obstacle to the despotism of the State. So evident is this, that it is utterly inconceivable that it can be the love of liberty which is the motive of the war declared against the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, who is the sole remaining bulwark of the freedom of the human family.

The adversary rejoins :—But what have civil liberties to do with the Pontifical States, or their maintenance ? And how will the development of constitutional principles be hindered by “the High Priest returning to his nets ?”

The advocate thereupon develops his views of the consequences resulting from the principles of modern liberalism, which he considers to be subversive of genuine liberty. His argument is briefly this : that, while upholding the doctrine of popular sovereignty, it tends in reality to the absorption of all power by the State ; that the people are cheated into believing that they are in possession of the reins of government, because they enjoy the privilege, some dozen times in their lives, of throwing a ticket

into an electoral urn, in favour of some deputy they have perhaps never set eyes on, when all the while they are being despoiled of all actual voice and influence in their own affairs by the increasing interference of the omnipotent State in every department of social life—education, marriage, benevolence, traffic, industry, liberty of association, &c. The day when the Pope becomes a subject, there will be in the world as many specimens of the Pontifex Maximus as there are Cæsars great and small, who will pretend to govern souls as they rule the body. What human pride aims at, in short, in its war with the Pontiff, will then have been attained, and the human race will be abandoned to the empire of a few despots, ruling under the name of the sovereign people. So that, when “the high priest” returns to his nets, not “priests and friars, Canonici and Monsignori, only will be the sufferers;” but all amongst the laity who have any sentiment of the dignity of human nature, or who value the liberty and independence of conscience.

The subject of the next conversation is the objection to the temporal power of the Pope, drawn from the sacrifice of the interests of the Roman people to the supposed good of the Church at large. Grant, urges the opponent, that the advantages which accrue to the Christian world may be ever so great, you will never persuade me that three millions of human creatures must be sacrificed for the benefit of others; and that we must be deprived of liberty, independence, and what not, without hope of remedy, that the rest of the world may enjoy these blessings. The Neapolitan friend joins issue on this ground, and, after allowing for exaggeration, observes that the argument may be reduced to this compass:—That in the Pontifical States the special condition of the prince entails some inconvenience in the conduct of public affairs, and renders either difficult or impossible the enjoyment of certain civil advantages which would be otherwise easily attainable. Why is there not room here for the application of a maxim so much used and abused in the present times, viz., that individual good must give way to the universal benefit? He adds his impression that from what he has seen in the Pontifical dominions the evils cannot be of the magnitude asserted, while the compensations which these States enjoy in having Rome for their capital, and from the circumstance that Rome is the capital of the whole Catholic world, are manifest to all.

The advocate, while admitting the justice of the argument grounded on hypothetical concession, combats the hypothesis itself. And, first, he denies that the quality of Sovereign Pontiff in the prince, and the ecclesiastical character of some of his chief ministers, offer any necessary impediment to the real civil progress (*civiltà*) of his subjects: on the contrary, such an administration renders the advantages incidental to other forms of government more easy of attainment, besides possessing some that are proper to itself. That the ruler of the Roman people cannot, from the circumstance of his condition, make practical application of those modern ideas, the origin of which Cousin traces to Luther's day, he believes to be no misfortune to them; but he cannot conceive any duty incumbent on a good prince which may not be excellently, and even perfectly, performed by a priest or a pontiff. The end which the civil government and the priesthood pursue

being respectively the temporal and the eternal good of the same subject, man, the two offices, so far from being opposed to each other, must admirably agree and coincide. The good of the people also depends much more upon the men who work their institutions than upon the character of the institutions themselves. Imperfect institutions and good men will result in a tolerable government; excellent institutions and bad men will make a people miserable. The Neapolitan cordially agrees, and marvels at the intense occupation of the modern brain in framing new constitutions, and the little anxiety that is shown to improve men; whereas the Gospel, to which we owe the civil regeneration of the world, says not a syllable of public institutions, but is all directed to the correction and perfecting of the individual man; a proof positive that where these objects are effected the rest is sure to follow. Hence the advocate concludes that the surest guarantee of good civil government must ever lie in the Christian principles upon which that government is based and the Christian conscience of the governor. Now these securities exist most amply where it is an utter impossibility to separate the government from Christian principles, and where the conscience of the ruler is the conscience, not only of a Christian, but of a priest.

The adversary declines proceeding on the principles of logic and the *à priori* form of argument, and falls back upon facts. Under the dominion of priests, he says, the Roman people have become the most retrograde in all that regards civil progress, and the most miserable people on the face of the earth. The chief charges specified—for the actual vices of the administration are stated to be innumerable—are arbitrary government, favour prevailing over merit, inertness in the ruling power, which does nothing while others are doing so much, industry languishing, commerce hampered, legislation in confusion, privileged tribunals maintained, mendicity rife, priests and friars devouring a third, or perhaps the half, of the public fortune. The advocate replies, in the first place, that when a government is characterized as good, the epithet must be understood in a relative sense; so that, in predicating of the Roman people that they are well off, he means, not that things could not be better, but that they are well off by comparison with other people. Where anything is amiss in the administration of the government he is quite free to confess there is room for improvement. Secondly, and of this he is confident, that considering the difficulties of the times, and the peculiar embarrassments hence resulting to the Pontifical Government, for which, assuredly, it is not to be held responsible, public prosperity is maintained to a degree which might excite the envy of many secular governments, were there sharper eyes for perceiving the good, and less disposition to deny it when perceived. As charges of arbitrary government and inertness involve questions of fact, with facts alone, and not with sweeping and vague accusations, ought men to rest satisfied. And he shrewdly remarks that there are governments where, if a man spoke of the rulers as his opponent speaks of the Pope, he would long ago have been in the galleys or an exile in some distant, pestiferous colony. As for the political prisoners in the Roman States, believe me, he says, they have been convicted of something more than *thinking* and *speaking*. But how many in number, he inquires, do you suppose them to be? and remember, some were condemned before

the Piedmontese invasion had reduced the Roman States to their present narrow limits.—“Some thousands, it is believed at the caffès, but who knows!” So it might be, is the reply, if all had their deserts; but, as a matter of fact, the number is exactly fifty-three. And how many thousands, observes the Secretary, groan in the prisons of Italy, and especially of Naples, to whom not a thought is given; but then the gaolers of Naples are own brothers to the prisoners at Rome, and that makes all the difference.

With regard to the charge of confused legislation, he observes that the law of the Pontifical States is the ancient Roman, with such modifications as have been introduced from time to time during eight centuries, up to the present day, when other reforms are in contemplation. The law of the other European States is in a great measure grounded on the same system of jurisprudence; and as to the Roman law in particular, it has been admired and commended by high authority among the legists of other countries. As for the priests, monks, and nuns, he charges his opponent with regarding them as a strange race who have been rained down, as it were, from the skies, like so many locusts and caterpillars, to devour the people's substance. But are they not themselves an integral portion of the people, freely embracing a vocation by which they have the life-use of certain goods, and thus relieve their families, and thin the ranks of the needy and ambitious; not to speak of other inestimable advantages, even in the material order, which they procure for their countrymen? To look at the subject only from an economical point of view:—he has himself an uncle a canon, a brother a religious, and two nieces nuns. Now, as his family is far from rich, it has been, pecuniarily, a great relief that these relations have thus been provided for. Should the spoliation of Piedmont throw them on the world for maintenance, his domestic circumstances would be far from being bettered. And the same would be the case with thousands of families. As for the inertness of the Papal Government, in order to disprove it, it would be needful to recapitulate all that that Government has done and is doing—no slight task. For a detailed account he refers them to a little work bearing this very title, “Inertness of the Pontifical Government,” which treats of every branch of the administration, and specially of all that has been effected of late years for the advantage of industry and commerce. Well as he was acquainted with the activity of the Holy Father in promoting the good of his subjects, he confesses that he was quite amazed when he saw in a condensed form what he had hitherto only viewed in detail; he was amazed at the amount of the work accomplished in so short a time, and confirmed in his opinion that the Roman Government can stand in this respect a comparison with any other administration, especially when the smallness of the Pontifical States and their special difficulties from external causes are taken into account. Were it not for the Satanic enmity ever existing in the world against Christ and His Vicar, and the stupid prejudice which believes and repeats the worst, only because it has heard it, the truth of this assertion would be palpable to all. The opponent answers with a sneer that such documents are dictated by Government. “*Cicero pro domo sua*” must always be in the right. For his own part he never reads such productions. Here the Secretary interposes, and points out

to his friend the unfairness of refusing to hear both sides. Even were it true that the Government had a hand in the publication, it would be fair to hear what it had to say for itself; and, at any rate, facts and statistics can be verified. But such documents, rejoins the opponent, abound with the most monstrous assertions. Witness an assertion in a journal which he found some friends of his were perusing the other day, to this effect:—That the Roman people were “the most comfortable in circumstances, the most civilized, and the freest in the world.” The Secretary owns that this was going too far. The advocate, however, joins issue, and maintains that there is truth in the assertion, when the words “people,” “liberty,” “civilization,” and “easy circumstances” are taken in the sense attached to them by the writer.

Some observations follow upon the ambiguity of the term “people,” and the abuse that is made of it. The collective word, which imports universality, has a very clear meaning when that which is attributed to it is in its nature universal. To say the people wish to be well off, need food and clothing, &c., is to say what is true without exception; but when we come to speak of votes, opinions, aspirations, exigencies, affections, inclinations, it is plain that in all these cases, where free will steps in and differences of judgment exist, universality is not to be found, so nothing can be more incorrect than to speak of what the people wishes or thinks, as certain men do. For instance, they who affirm that the Roman people desire to have nothing more to do with the Pope and his government, cannot maintain that their assertion is *literally* true, taking the word “people” in its universal sense; for the clergy and monks, and their favourers are, after all, people in as true a sense as the rest, and it is not fair to exclude them. They also are people who in crowds show their spontaneous affection and reverence to the Holy Father on all public occasions; so that the “universality” is a conception of the mind rather than a real entity. But the majority—what of them? How (is the reply) has this majority been ascertained, and when? In fact, what our opponent means by “the people” is themselves—the revolutionary party, who are very far from constituting the numerical majority. When we speak of liberty, well-being, and civil prosperity, the signification of the word *people* should be restricted to the true multitude, which consists mainly of artisans, labourers,—what are termed the common people. Now it is the distinguishing glory of the Roman Pontiffs that their truly Christian rule has been directed to securing the well-being and happiness of the great mass of the population.

The subject of squalidness and mendicity is treated in the succeeding number. I pray you to consider, observes the advocate, that if the Pope should desire to sweep Rome clear of all its uncleanness, and of all its beggars, he could do it easily within twenty-four hours. He need only fulminate an order for every one to keep clean the space before his house under a severe penalty for neglect, and another forbidding begging, and sending beggars to prison. Apply this remedy, and to-morrow morning you shall have Rome as clear of dirt and beggars as Oxford Street or the Rue de Rivoli. But if the thing be so easy, why is it not done? That is a question upon which our friend has something to say hereafter; for the present all he will say is this, that if for some reason the Pope has not seen fit, and does

not see fit, to do it, it is only natural that the needy man should avail himself of the right, which modern society denies him almost everywhere else, of holding out his hand to his fellow-creature for alms. What wonder that where paupers are not merely tolerated in the public streets, but pitied and relieved—where the Christian mother puts an obolo into her baby's hand, and bids it give it to the beggar for the love of God—what wonder that the poor should not only show themselves but even throng the thoroughfares? The greater part of the beggars in Rome, in fact, have been ascertained not to be natives of the States; and the late annexations of Piedmont have greatly added to their number.

As to the further question, how paupers should be dealt with, of course there are two views. You may immure them in workhouses, where they may be stintily provided for, and the delicacy of the rich and voluptuous may be spared the spectacle of squalid misery and the annoyance of importunity. This is one way; but it happens not to be the Pope's way at Rome. We proceed on other principles, and where living by alms *may* be a practice of evangelical perfection, the doing so from blameless need cannot be reputed a crime. The number of beggars in Rome is to be taken, not as the measure of want, but rather of that general easiness of circumstances which enables men to give, and, above all, the Christian feeling which prompts them to be charitable to the poor. Then follows a contrast between the Christian mode of regarding the poor and that of the social economists of our day. The advocate, however, does not disguise the inconveniences and abuses which may, and often do, follow from the liberty of asking alms; but this he contends is a reason, not for abrogating a Christian right, but for keeping it within due limits. The Popes, in several of their Bulls, have shown themselves quite aware of the evil of people begging, who might and ought to work, and thus living idly on the earnings of others. [In fact, an authoritative notification was issued at Rome, March 30th of the current year, imposing considerable restrictions upon mendicancy. By the provisions of this regulation, begging is limited to such as are proper objects of charity, and the importunity even of those licensed to ask alms is checked, since they are forbidden to beg *within* the churches, or inside shops, inns, caffes, &c. The mendicants who crowd in from the neighbouring country, and have obtained no legal settlement in Rome, are to be sent back to their own parish, or to the frontier.]

The line of argument pursued in these papers, it will be observed, is based on principles rather than on an accumulation of facts and statistics. Those at a distance are apt to mistrust official reports, and to suspect that, granting the facts to be as stated, a catena might be produced on the other side. But if it can be proved that such practical grievances as exist in the Roman States, do not spring from any cause *essential to priestly rule*, or, at most, are abuses of a principle good in itself, much will have been effected in the way of disarming hostile prejudice, where it is founded only on ignorance and misconception. The remaining paper chiefly respects the amount of personal liberty possessed by the Roman people; in particular, their immunity from the conscription, and the educational advantages enjoyed by the poor; and those not only of a moral and intellectual kind, but also æsthetic

—a branch of education which has come to be considered, in the present day, even by the advocates of mere secular progress, as of great importance in the work of civilization.

Le Correspondant. Paris : Douniol. 1863.

FROM the many papers worthy of notice, we single out a very able one, entitled *La Diplomatie du Suffrage Universel*, from the pen of Albert de Broglie. A new principle has gained a footing in the public law of Europe during the last thirty years, viz., the absolute right which every state possesses of changing, by universal suffrage, its internal constitution, modifying all its international relations, and emancipating itself from all treaties and general conventions. The object of the writer is to indicate the difficulties and perils attached to the carrying out of this new principle, which is fast sweeping away, if it has not already swept away, all the results of the accumulated experience of ages, during which the problem has been, How to enable nations to live side by side in peace and independence,—in fact, to establish an international law of order and justice. The difficulty of enforcing a law, for the due observance of which no tribunal exists which has been accepted, even in theory, since Europe emerged from the middle ages, suggested the principle of the balance of power; the rights of the minor states being placed under the guardianship of the greater ones, bound by treaties to that effect. To the maintenance of this principle—imperfectly as it has been observed (witness the iniquitous partition of Poland)—Europe owes whatever years of peace and security she has enjoyed since its first adoption. Two things (says the writer) have hitherto served as guarantees to the peace of Europe: first, a fact—equality maintained amongst a few great powers; next, a right—an engagement, explicit or tacit, not to alter, without common consent, the re-partition of territory agreed upon. It is evident that the new theory entirely destroys the latter condition, and thus leads, by necessary consequence, to the destruction of the first. Every little State being able to vote its annexation to a greater, without any one having the right to oppose the transaction, this mode of acquisition becomes equivalent to a conquest: we have only a change of the form and of the terms employed.

Along with the destroyed equilibrium disappears the hitherto recognised law, the sole remaining barrier which modern civilization had devised to check the development of the “egoistical personality” of any people. Have we not reason, then, to dread what we may well regard as the inevitable goal to which this new principle tends,—the formation, with time, of a preponderating power swelled by the superposition of conquests—annexation, if you will—deriving from its victory of yesterday the strength to satisfy its fancy of to-morrow; the earth groaning under its weight, and strewn with the ruins it has made. The writer proceeds to discuss the illusive notions of those who imagine that all national rivalries are about to disappear in the great fraternity of democratic institutions; and another equally potent panacea anticipated in the principle of nationality, by the carrying out of

which every people will settle down according to its natural affinities, and the chief causes of war thus be removed. For the discussion of these points we refer our readers to the essay itself.

In the number for April appeared an article on Colenso and the Anglican Church, by the Abbé Meignan. Speaking of the choice made of the "missionary bishop," and of Dr. Colenso's antecedents and personal call to that office, the reviewer says: "Theological science had no peculiar attractions for him, neither had his evangelical zeal made itself remarkable—but what of that? The vocation of a missionary destined to evangelize the savages of the Cape is not apt, in England, to be developed amongst those whose position and education point them out for the more lucrative foreign posts. Men are, perhaps, unjust, and do not make sufficient allowance for circumstances, when, with some of the English newspapers, they throw blame on those who chose Dr. Colenso for the see of Natal. In such cases, people must, in a measure, take what they can get: geographers, botanists, clerks who are bored at home and would like to see the world." With that light and lively touch in which the French excel, and to which the French language so admirably lends itself, the Abbé proceeds to describe, in a few words, the Bishop's conversion, or rather perversion, by his black neophyte, and all that ensued, with which the English public are well acquainted.

With respect to the book itself, the Abbé observes: "We should have expected from a bishop, although but newly enrolled amongst the Rationalist recruits of the day, on the other side of the Channel, something more profound, less narrow, less feeble, and, above all, less superannuated. The authors of the 'Essays and Reviews' had been more careful of their reputation: true, they invented nothing themselves, but at least they borrowed cleverly. Bunsen had furnished them with a whole arsenal of modern arguments, and although it was perceptible that such cloudy sophisms had never been the production of the manly and vigorous good sense of the English people, still it was clear that, while handling biblical questions somewhat at random, at least, they took them up in their modern form, and had the intention of treating them from the nineteenth century point of view. But Dr. Colenso, in his first volume, carries us back at once to the eighteenth century. We have Voltaire again, without his coarse sarcasm—but also without his genius; Voltaire compounded with the close arithmetician; Voltaire judging antiquity, which he has never studied, according to the vulgar ideas (*idées bourgeoises*) of his time." The reviewer then sums up briefly the chief difficulties or impossibilities which Colenso has discovered for himself in the sacred text—for himself, for he has since acknowledged that their novelty was but relative; "new to myself and very many of my readers." The second volume the Abbé considers a little less superannuated than the first, but says that the hypothesis on which it is grounded dates from the seventeenth century. The few remarks which he makes in the way of reply are rather cursory suggestions than direct answers, but we may quote the following observation:—

"The books [of Holy Scripture] were written originally only for those familiar with tradition; and passages which appear to us inexplicable now,

because unexplained, were clear enough to them. The conciseness of the Bible, its reticences, transpositions, and the liberty it allows itself in the use of language, are known to all philologists. The sacred books ought to be explained by men of learning, and not abandoned to the interpretations of ignorant pedants, who make their own impressions the ground of absurd objections against a text which they do not understand, and which, in the entirety of its scope, their minds will never be competent to grasp. English Protestants, those prodigal sowers of bibles, will soon be obliged to do justice to the needful reserve and practical wisdom of the Catholic Church in its use of Holy Scripture."

But the main object of the reviewer is not to drag to light the poverty of Dr. Colenso's arguments, but to expose the situation in which the Anglican Church is placed by the Rationalist movement now in progress even amongst the higher ranks of her clergy : the powerlessness of the prosecutions directed against the impugnors of the Thirty-nine Articles, the complicity of the laity, and the impossibility in which the Anglican bishops find themselves of expelling the convicted culprits ; in all which he sees a commencement of organic decomposition in the body of the Established Church. Dr. Colenso's writings must be viewed, not in their own intrinsic worthlessness, but as a significant token that the Rationalism which had already insinuated itself amongst the Anglican clergy, as is proved by the "Essays and Reviews," is now striving to obtain for itself a recognised position. Will it succeed ? We are but at the beginning of a contest the importance of which is not to be estimated either by the powers of the assailants, which are no way extraordinary, or by their published works, which are argumentatively feeble. What constitutes its real importance is, on the one hand, the growing strength of the assailing force, and, on the other, the progressively diminishing vigour of the defence. Of the refutations put forth by Anglican bishops and others, Catholics of course have nothing to say but what is favourable ; many might be unreservedly commended, if the authors had not thought it advisable to cater for a little popularity by gross abuse of the Catholic Church ; but when we come to look at the effect produced, we should fall into a great mistake if we imagined that it was by any means considerable.

As the Abbé justly observes, "When a book comes opportunely to give expression to ideas that are working in men's minds, it is read by every one ; but the interest it excites exhausts the popular curiosity. The refutations attract but little notice, being read chiefly by persons whose opinions already coincide with those of the writers ; so that the very number of these refutations does little more than attest the success of the attack. The favour with which the public received the 'Essays and Reviews' was not checked by the answers they elicited. The professors only obtained a little more popularity, and the preachers a little more notoriety. The prelates then betook themselves to the law, but only to render more patent the weakness of their Church. Possessing no spiritual authority, they can merely give an opinion ; they can pronounce no judgment, save through tribunals in which lay judges have usurped the place of ecclesiastical. Moreover, these judges do not pretend to pronounce upon truth or error ; so that their judgment, if in accordance with the wishes of the friends of orthodoxy, can be of no ecclesiastical weight—it is simply a legal decision whether or no a doctrine is

in agreement with the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. Everybody knows very well that the 'Essays and Reviews,' as well as Colenso's book, are contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles—they knew it quite as well before the Court of Arches pronounced its decision as they did afterwards. What people feel to be the real question is, whether the Thirty-nine Articles are conformable to truth. The sentence of a year's suspension, without any call for retractation, was nothing short of derisory. It virtually left the Rationalists encamped on the field. It was the first step to a victory. It were needless to point out what an advantage Colenso draws from the issue of the proceedings instituted against the 'Essays and Reviews.' He boldly attacks the faith of the Church and the Thirty-nine Articles, and he calls on the clergy to revolt against the Episcopacy and the law. He looks for the support of the clergy." After quoting some passages from the work, in which Colenso complains of the captivity of thought and conscience under which the Anglican clergy groan through the tyrannical obligations of their ordination oath, an increasing horror of which is deterring the flower of England's intellectual youth from entering its ranks, the reviewer observes that all these complaints would be so much empty declamation if the Anglican Church rested upon any sure basis; for every society has the right to expel from its bosom those who contravene the conditions which are essential to its existence. If the Thirty-nine Articles are its constitutive act, who that attacks this charter can have a right to grumble at being turned out?

But men naturally feel that the question is not so simple, and that the situation is complicated by the anarchical principles of Protestantism; for Protestantism, as every one knows, rests upon the right of private judgment and individual criticism. The Anglican Church set up the pretension of remaining Catholic while separating from the Head of the Catholic Church: Dr. Colenso and his party, in their turn, claim a right to continue Anglicans while rejecting the principles of the Anglican Church. What dogmatic value have the statutes of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth? Do these names represent any theological authority? If, then, they have no other value than have other State laws and political acts, why, in a country where all laws are reformable by an appeal to public opinion and Parliament, should Colenso and his friends be debarred the right to attack the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, which may be suppressed by the same authority that enacted them? This it is which renders the religious question now agitating England one of so serious a nature. The Anglican Church can oppose to the innovators only Articles without authority, and the external rigours of the law. The Anglican prelates endeavour, indeed, to use a better weapon, and appeal to theological reasons, tradition, and sound criticism. But theological discussion will never exercise any control over minds. Discussion awakens doubt. Authority alone can settle the question and put an end to debate. What has happened in Germany, in Holland, and in all countries where free discussion has had no corrective and moderator in legitimate authority, the reviewer apprehends will eventually take place in England. The masses love novelty, and the attack will triumph over the defence. It is already a significant fact that the number of copies sold of the "Essays and Reviews" in 1862 amounted to 20,000, while the "Aids to

Faith," by the Archbishop of York, found only 7,000 purchasers. "The pioneers of the future" (to use the expression of a Rationalist journal) "are not all outside the Church: within it there are the Maurices, the Kingsleys, the authors of the *Essays*, Colenso." Neither is there unanimity even among the bishops themselves; witness the late charge of Dr. Tait, the Anglican Bishop of London, who deprecates judicial prosecutions in matters of dogma. "After all," he says, "we are Protestants, and have been accustomed to value highly the right and duty of private judgment." The Abbé concludes his review by a consoling reflection which, as Catholics, will suggest itself to us all:—"We, too, have a battle to wage with the Rationalists of the day; but how different the terms of the contest, how different the certainty of its issue!"

NOTE TO ARTICLE ON FRENCH ELECTIONS.

As we are going to press we observe an announcement in the *Weekly Register*, which, as containing a correction of a statement made, as it appears, on insufficient information, by the writer of the above-mentioned article, we deem of sufficient importance to present to our readers. It is as follows:—Certain English newspapers "a few weeks back drew very large conclusions from the support given by the Bishop of St. Brieuc, in Brittany, to the Government candidate against the Count de Montalembert. About the same time it was stated that the Bishop had deprived the printer to the diocese of his office, held by his family for near two hundred years, for his support of the Count. In the Bishop's letter contradicting this calumny, he dropped an expression implying that the Count de Montalembert's candidature was too late. We have now the opportunity of explaining upon good authority what the circumstances thus alluded to really were. The Bishop, it will be seen, could not state them publicly. In the original programme of candidates supported by the Emperor's Government, M. de Persigny had put down for the department Côtes-du-Nord, which is continuous with the diocese of St. Brieuc, a gentleman against whom the Bishop and clergy felt the strongest objection. The Bishop felt this so strongly that he sought an interview with the Emperor and stated his objections. They were received in a manner honourable to both parties. The objectionable candidate was withdrawn and another substituted, to whom the Bishop promised his support. It was after this that the Count de Montalembert was proposed. We can imagine nothing more painful to a Catholic bishop than any circumstance which made it appear as if he were opposed to a man so distinguished, to whom the cause of religion and of the Church owes so much, and who has never hesitated to sacrifice to it his dearest personal interests. We cannot doubt that the Bishop of St. Brieuc, if he had consulted his feelings and wishes, would, like the Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon, have called his clergy together and declared his opinion that it would be a disgrace to them all if such a candidate as Montalembert did not receive their unanimous support. But the Bishop was bound by his previous promise, on the strength of which the Government candidate had been selected."

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1863.

ART. I.—DR. HOOK'S LIVES OF THE ARCHBISHOPS
OF CANTERBURY.

Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D.,
Dean of Chichester. Vol. II. Anglo-Norman Period. Second edition.
London: Bentley. 1862.

WHEN the last successor of S. Augustine the monk in the See of Canterbury had been buried in the person of Reginald Pole, Cardinal of S. Maria in Cosmedin, by the tomb of S. Thomas—emptied of the sacred relics—Matthew Parker, who had obtained possession of some of their estates, collected materials for writing the *Lives of the Archbishops, Primates of All England and ex officio Legates of the Holy See*. He was assisted in this work by his friends, but his principal strength lay in his secretary, John Jocelyn, who is probably the real compiler of the book "*De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*," from which Godwin pilfered without shame when he wrote the *Lives of all the English Bishops*.

Jocelyn's book is scarce—perhaps it was never published in the modern sense of that word; it was reprinted abroad, and, except as a curiosity, is worth nothing now, owing to the elaborate edition of Drake. The original editions of Godwin are also valueless in the presence of the last edition by Richardson, who has corrected the many blunders which Henry Wharton, in his zeal for Jocelyn, pointed out with no small indignation, and perhaps not without some satisfaction also.

Until our own day Parker and Godwin have had no successors, though the need may have been felt, and the materials have grown abundant. Kings and queens, chancellors and chief justices, and the judges generally have had their biographers. The archbishops had no remembrancers till Dr. Hook, Dean of Chichester, arose, who with discordant sounds breaks the silence of two centuries and a half, not in the spirit of Parker

and of Godwin, who hated, and in a manner feared, the archbishops gone to their rest, but in a spirit altogether his own, scoffing, sceptical, and unjust. Parker dealt with the archbishops as with men who belonged to another world, and of another order, with whom he had nothing in common. To him they were a race extinct, without successors, never to return in any form. He hated them and their ways, but he was afraid of them somehow, and never had the stupid courage to make jests at their expense. The old hierarchy in its stately pomp had disappeared, and even the outward signs of the old religion were gone for ever in his eyes : to him a deluge seemed to have intervened between himself and Cardinal Pole. With Dr. Hook it is quite otherwise : he labours to identify the successors of Matthew Parker with the successors of S. Augustine, and would persuade his readers, if he could, that Dr. Longley is as much the Archbishop of Canterbury as Lanfranc. Matthew Parker lived too near the great catastrophe—and the traces of the deluge were too visible—to deceive himself, or attempt to deceive his readers. He had lived, as it were, in the days before the flood, for he was an apostate priest, and knew what was said and done by the men whose lives he described. It was therefore impossible for him even to imagine that there could be any resemblance between the bishops and preachers whom he made by the new rites of man's invention, and the old prelates and priests who said mass and obeyed, however imperfectly, the mandates of the Pope. Not so Dr. Hook : he lives in another generation, in which Joseph is unknown ; and though a minister of a new religion, would rather trace his relationship to the Pope, than be acknowledged as the elder brother of the dissenting gentleman who preaches in Salem Chapel. Thus we hear from him, that "the Archbishop of York was a sound Anglican" (p. 252) ; and that "a very simple daily service was ordered" (p. 592) in the twelfth century. Again : "a special form of prayer was appointed" (p. 560) ; S. Anselm finds "comfort in the daily service" (p. 275) ; S. Thomas "celebrates the Holy Communion" (p. 490) ; and Archbishop Baldwin, going into Wales to preach the Crusade, reminds him "of the manner in which the cause of the African mission was supported on a late occasion, by the co-operation of one of our most gifted prelates, in conjunction with the most eloquent of our lawyers and statesmen" (p. 560). Speaking of S. Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, who arranged the "Use of Sarum," he says that he was "appointed to act as precentor of the Episcopal College, and to conduct the services whenever the prelates assembled in synod. The title is still retained by the indefatigable, learned, and pious prelate who

occupies the See of Salisbury at the present time; who has, indeed, proved himself to be the worthy successor of Bishop Osmund, by helping to prepare, and by giving his sanction to, a hymn-book for his diocese, which is likely soon to become the use of the whole province" (p. 165). If this passage had been intended for irony it might pass, but even then it would be clumsy; but as a serious comparison of the labours of S. Osmund with those of Dr. Hamilton—compiling a hymn-book—it becomes ridiculous and offensive. But Dr. Hamilton is the person to complain of it. Dr. Hook, not satisfied with violence done to historical facts, descends to a lower deep, and interprets what he does not understand by the help of unbelieving men, whom he prefers to the saints he vilifies. Thus, S. Peter Damian becomes "a canonized fanatic" (p. 438); S. Anselm, because he obeyed his confessor, sank into "moral imbecility" (p. 267). Of Hubert Walters, Archbishop of Canterbury, he says, without a shadow of reason, that he was one of those who "accepted bishoprics without believing in the Divine institution of Episcopacy" (p. 600). To Pope Callixtus II. he applies the words, "like a tall bully who lifts his head and lies" (p. 292). Of the Holy See he says, "what was called the Apostolic See" (p. 32); and finally, adopting the language of infidelity, he writes, "of all the phenomena of insanity, the Crusades were the most astonishing" (p. 35).

This spirit of hatred is relieved, for the benefit of another class of readers, by the spirit of buffoonery, as it shows itself in the modern way. Lanfranc, providing books for the library of the monks at Canterbury, founded "a lending library" (p. 107). "From the monastery went forth the Scripture-reader to visit the sick" (p. 20). The labours of Eustace of Flaye, in denouncing fairs and markets, with their attendant evils, on Sunday, are called the "Sabbatarian Controversy" (p. 648). When S. Anselm by the bedside of William Rufus refused to be invested with the staff and ring, he is said to have "put his hands in his pockets" (p. 192); and when he received the pallium before the high altar of Canterbury he "unpacked the box" (p. 215) in which it had been brought from Rome. Lanfranc's meditations on the Four Last Things is called "Eschatology" (p. 84).

There are many phrases in this work which seem to proceed from a spirit which has shaken off early impressions, and eliminated from its received opinions—for faith we cannot speak of—most of the doctrines current among the better sort of Protestants. If we are to judge of Dr. Hook by the statements he makes, we should say that he has abandoned almost

every definite proposition of theology, and has come down into the thick darkness, where all is obscure and where nothing is certain. The following passage will make plain our meaning, for we prefer that, in a matter of this importance, Dr. Hook should be the expounder of his own views :—

Amid all diversities of opinions, however, the unity of the Church is preserved, and, in the language of primitive Christianity, its orthodoxy is affirmed, *so long as it adheres to the one centre doctrine of the whole Christian scheme*, asserted by the Council of Nice, and zealously watched by each succeeding council, assuming to be oecumenical—the Incarnation of the Eternal Son of God. This has always been called the Catholic faith. *So long as he relies on the one Mediator* between God and man, the Son of God incarnate, a Christian remains a Christian, however much his mind may be deformed by strange doctrines not inconsistent with this fundamental fact ; just as man is man, whether seated on the throne of an emperor, or pining upon inadequate food in the hut of the Esquimaux.—(P. 760).

We make no reflections on this passage, and pass on to the consideration of the historical value of Dr. Hook's work. After an elaborate "introduction," in which he misrepresents, but without intending to do so, the whole spirit and character of the Middle Ages, he enters on the life of Lanfranc, who became Archbishop of Canterbury at the Conquest.

Lanfranc had refused the archbishopric of Rouen, and was with difficulty persuaded to accept that of Canterbury. He had left Pavia, his native place, and had settled at Avranches, in Normandy, where he taught with great success, and was attended by crowds who listened to him with the most careful attention. Divine grace moved him to abandon the world, and to retire into the cloister. He was not disobedient to the heavenly voice, and, quitting Avranches, made his way to Rouen, and finally to Bec, where a new monastery was struggling under the great Herluin. Dr. Hook, unable to comprehend the vocation of Lanfranc, says that he was now "subjected to one of those sudden conversions" (p. 79) which he traces "to the loss of his wife ;" a supposition perfectly groundless, for, though none of Lanfranc's biographers say that he was never married, yet, as Dr. Hook himself admits, there is nothing recorded of him which tends in the slightest degree to give the least excuse for this strange explanation of an act which is not uncommon. He quitted Avranches suddenly, without giving notice to his auditors ; but that fact was not without precedent nor extravagant, and is perfectly consistent with previous deliberation—perhaps even a proof of Lanfranc's careful weighing of what he was about to do. At Bec he was received by Herluin, and admitted among the monks :—

It was Brother Lanfranc's turn to read in hall. He was proceeding with a sentence in which the word "docere" occurred, and he of course pronounced it properly, with the middle syllable long. "Docere, docere," said the prior, rather pompously, and "docere" was repeated by Brother Lanfranc.—(P. 88).

Dr. Hook has failed to understand the story, and has also told it inaccurately. There is no evidence that the corrected word was "docere;" that word is used by way of illustration, but it is not given as the word in question. The pomposity of the prior is a pure myth; and when Dr. Hook says that "Lanfranc may have amused his friends by relating the occurrence, for he had a sense of the ridiculous," he confesses that he has not comprehended the fact. Lanfranc was a monk learning obedience, and if he had amused himself with the prior's correction, he would have himself failed precisely as Dr. Hook has failed. The prior was a man of great simplicity, not learned, and Lanfranc was a novice of great fame for learning: the story is perfectly natural; but Dr. Hook, with his intrepid carelessness, has disfigured it. Thus in the matter of the "lending library" which Lanfranc founded at Canterbury, we are told that the librarian "handed over to the chapter a list of the books lent, and of the persons to whom they had been allotted" (p. 108). The monks of Canterbury assembled in the chapter-house on the appointed day, returned the books previously lent, and received each another, when the librarian made a minute of the transaction in the chapter-room, all the monks being present; and this Dr. Hook translates "handed over to the chapter."*

Blunders of this kind prove beyond all doubt that Dr. Hook is not to be trusted. He has written in haste; and being not very learned in the manners and speech of the people about whom he writes, falls naturally into mistakes, and avoids none which sustain his prejudices. It is therefore by no means difficult to ascertain the true value of Dr. Hook's historical labours. They show that he is not familiar with the history of the times he describes; that he does not understand the language in which most of it is written; and that he has not ascertained the sources of his information.

At page 127 he makes mention of the trial on Penenden Heath, where Lanfranc recovered the possessions of his see from Odo of Bayeux, who, though a bishop as well as an earl, had stolen many manors from the Church of Canterbury. "Every reader," says Dr. Hook, "will have read of the celebrated suit on Penenden Heath; but unless he has the

* *Distributis per ordinem libris, præfatus librorum custos in eodem capitulo imbreviet nomina librorum, et eos recipientium.*—*Const. Lanfranc.*

means of referring to Wilkins' 'Concilia' he cannot have seen the original report" (p. 127). Wilkins has certainly published a copy of that "original report," but every reader knows that Wilkins cannot be the original reporter. Now, Wilkins is not the only one, nor the first, who printed that document: whether it be a "report" or not we leave to the lawyers to determine. Selden had published it before him, in his notes to Eadmer; so had Wharton, in the "Anglia Sacra;" and Alford, in his "Annales." Any one of these books is more accessible than Wilkins', and all of them together may be purchased at less than half the price of the "Concilia."

Again, summing up the decrees of a synod in London, he says, "chalices were sometimes of wax or wood" (p. 149). Chalices of wax must have been curiosities. The learned Doctor did not see that *cerei* was a misprint in Wilkins for *arei*, "of brass."

Again, when speaking of S. Thomas, he says, "Becket was not quite orthodox in his flagellations; the orthodox discipline is thus described" (p. 439). This is followed by an extract out of the Dictionary of Ducange, with the reference "ii. 1528," but without any mention of the word under which it occurs—a mode of reference, considering that there are more editions than one of that work, about as reasonable as if the Bible were quoted by the page. It is difficult to see anything in the matter which could be a reproach to the martyr, because his private and voluntary disciplines could have nothing to do with the penitential discipline of the chapter in a house of regular observance, to which alone the extract from Ducange refers. It is about as reasonable to raise such an objection as it would be to blame a priest who said his office by himself, and not in choir, for neglecting the alternate recitation of the psalms. In short, Dr. Hook had no knowledge of the subject about which he writes: the interior discipline of a monastery is completely beyond the reach of his understanding; for if he had even the faintest perception of what it is, he never could have uttered the absurdity at page 543, where, speaking of monks, he says, "They then resorted to the chapter-house, where they confessed to one another—a practice which must have resembled a class-meeting and telling of their experience among modern Methodists."

Lanfranc, on the whole, obtains the commendation of his present biographer; but the chief ground of this commendation is, nevertheless, an hypothesis of Dr. Hook, and not a clearly ascertained fact. The imaginary marriage of Lanfranc when he was a layman, helps our author to explain an allegation made without authority. Of this conjectural marriage, he says that

what rendered it "more probable, is the fact that when Lanfranc became Archbishop of Canterbury he refused to press upon the Church of England the celibacy of the clergy with that stringency with which it had been enforced in the Church of Rome" (p. 81). This negligence of Lanfranc was not without its fruits, for we learn that at a later period, according to Dr. Hook, "the bishops of the Church of England, being generally seculars, were not extreme to visit for the offence, when the clergyman's house was made respectable and happy by a wife and children" (p. 316).

"The bishops of the Church of England" were very much like the bishops of France or Spain in their dealings with the clerks of dishonest lives: they prohibited, they censured, and were not always able to check, an evil which in every generation pullulates more or less in some corner or other of the earth. If they were not able effectually to wipe out the scandal, which even Dr. Hook calls "an offence," they published canons, and instituted inquiries, and, finally, visited with punishment those miserable ecclesiastics who set aside the acknowledged obligations of their state, and lived too much like laymen. But as for the share of Lanfranc in vindicating the discipline of the Church, his present biographer does not do him justice; and the only proof of his allegation, in addition to that of the supposed wife of whom there is no trace, is a canon of the Council of Winchester, in 1076, which is thus summed up in the work before us: "Under these circumstances, all that the Synod of Winchester in 1076 decreed was, that none who were now in priest's orders should be permitted to marry, and that no married man should be hereafter ordained priest or deacon. The married men who were already in holy orders were not required to dismiss their wives" (p. 147).

Now, admitting this to be a true account of the Synod of Winchester, there is nothing in it by which it can be shown that marriage was either lawful, or even tolerated, in the priests. The "married men already in holy orders" may have been men who were so married before their ordination; and all that Dr. Hook, in the absence of other proofs, can make of this canon amounts only to this,—that married men having succeeded in procuring their admission to the priesthood were not required to send their wives away. That such ordinations took place may be inferred from the clause, "That no married man should hereafter be ordained priest or deacon." There is nothing here to show that priests after their ordination could lawfully marry.

The "marriage of priests" is an ambiguous phrase, and leads many who make use of it into mistakes. In the East there is a married, but not a marrying, clergy: the marriage takes

place previous to the ordination ; and if the wife dies on the day of her husband's admission to holy orders, that husband can never marry again. The sacrament has separated him from the world, and is become an impediment to marriage, never removed in the discipline even of those who have a married priesthood. In the West a married priesthood was never tolerated, and still less was it lawful for European clerks to do what is unlawful for their Oriental brethren. The Western ecclesiastic, if a married man, left his wife, who became a nun ; and on his admission to the priesthood and her reception into a religious house, the bond of matrimony however subsisting, a complete separation ensued, and they that had wives were as if they had none. The Western clerks, who made light of this law of their state, do not seem at any time to have married as if their marriage was lawful ; and there is no clear proof of their having regarded the evil lives they led other than as a violation of law, which their superiors were not always able to chastise. If Dr. Hook can find anything anywhere to show that persons in holy orders were at any time considered qualified recipients of the sacrament of marriage, he will do what none of his predecessors have done, and what so many have been anxious to effect. The Greek priests live in the state of matrimony, but they were laymen when they were married ; and their case furnishes neither example nor illustration of the doctrine which Dr. Hook holds—namely, that men already in holy orders may lawfully marry.

The Synod of Winchester, according to Dr. Hook, prohibited the marriages of priests for the future ; and all that he can make of it is, that the married clergy in certain places were not to be molested. But there is nothing to show that those clerks who were to escape punishment had married subsequently to their ordination ; and there is ground for asserting that they were married previous to their admission to holy orders, because the ordination of married men for the future is strictly forbidden : “ No married man should hereafter be ordained either priest or deacon.” If Lanfranc consented to leave the married priests unmolested—that is, in the possession of their benefices—he unquestionably did what no other bishop is recorded to have done. The law of the Church was so clear, and the Papal monitions were so multiplied and so exact, that more evidence than is furnished by this Synod of Winchester is required before it can be admitted that Lanfranc neglected his duty in so important a matter, and in open defiance of the ecclesiastical law.

This Synod of Winchester is said to have been held on the first day of April, 1076, and the only account of it we have is to be found in Matthew Parker's book, of which we have

already spoken. From that work it was copied by Wilkins, to whom Dr. Hook refers; and thus the sole printed account of that synod comes to us from a man who had a special interest in showing that priests might marry: he had been punished for that sin, for he was an apostate priest, and was then, in the palace at Lambeth, repeating the great scandal of Cranmer. Moreover, the text quoted by Parker is incomplete and ungrammatical, and resembles the title of a canon rather than the canon itself. Wilkins, copying from Parker, meets the difficulty by altering the text, whereby he makes sense of it, but does not add to its value. Were we to hazard a conjecture, we should say that the transcriber made a mistake not uncommon, by inserting *non* before *cogantur*,* and that the true account of the canon is, that it is like all the other canons of that age, requiring the dismissal of the wife, and prohibiting marriage in the future. We have also the testimony of S. Anselm, who says that in the days of Lanfranc these marriages were forbidden, and that no man could retain his benefice and his wife.† This canon of Lanfranc stands alone, without precedents and without imitations, and certainly requires something more than an arbitrary correction of a corrupt text before it can be admitted as proof of Lanfranc's negligence, or, as Dr. Hook will have it, systematic tolerance of a notorious sin.

Dr. Hook is not fortunate in his learning on the subject of clerical marriages, and it would have been more prudent to have passed the subject by without discussing it in the way he has chosen. So far as it concerns him and his fellow-ministers, the subject is without interest: nobody calls in question the validity or the lawfulness of the marriages of the Anglican clergy; and it is necessary to show, before the question becomes a practical one for them, that these ministers are in holy orders. In the Synod of Westminster, 1175, a decree was passed, thus summed up, not incorrectly, by Dr. Hook: "Let not sons be instituted into their fathers' benefices, unless some one succeed between them" (p. 531); but as it is a necessity of his position to find fault with the discipline of the Church, and especially with the acts of the Sovereign Pontiffs, he adds, in a note, "Yet Clement III., in the year 1189, allowed all sons of clergymen lawfully begotten to succeed their fathers. This decretal is extant in the first book, Tit. 17, c. 12." Now Clement III. did nothing of

* Parker's text is: "*Sacerdotum vero in castellis vel in vicis habitantium habentes uxores non cogantur, ut dimittant, non habentes, interdicantur ut habeant*" (p. 173, Ed. Drake). Wilkins changed the text in order to make something like sense; and so we have: "*sacerdotes—habitantes.*"

† S. Anselm, Ep. iii. 110.

the kind: the canon referred to allows the sons of bishops born in lawful wedlock to be beneficed in the churches which their fathers governed, but not to succeed to the benefices which they held. To have a benefice in a church is a very different thing from having in the same church the benefice held by the father. The son of a bishop lawfully born might become a canon in his father's cathedral; but he could not hold the particular canonry which his father had held, unless, in the meanwhile, it had been held by some one else intervening.

Throughout this most strange volume we meet with the same complacent blundering; which may be accounted for, though hardly excused, by the writer's exceedingly scanty acquaintance with the matters of which he treats. We learn from him that in the very beginning of the twelfth century the English bishops, under S. Anselm, were forbidden to "keep secular courts of pleas" (p. 251). If the writer had reflected upon what he wrote, he might have imagined, dimly at least, that he was making a mistake; for if the bishops did not hold "secular courts of pleas," their tenants and vassals would have been defrauded of justice. The bishops were not prohibited from holding their own courts, but from holding the courts of others—from becoming the justices of the barons and earls, who would have been too ready to give over their jurisdictions to be ordered by the bishops or other ecclesiastics who might have consented to do their work. The canon is clear enough: it forbids the bishops, not to hold secular courts, which they could not help doing, but to undertake the office of being secular judges for others—*ne Episcopi sæcularium placitorum officium suscipiant*; that is, they were not to become bailiffs and sheriffs, which they were not unwilling to do; for these secular functions possessed singular temptations in those days, even for archdeacons, abbots, and bishops.

If Dr. Hook had understood what he calls "the original report" of the suit on Penenden Heath, which he had discovered in Wilkins' "Concilia," he would have learnt from that document that the bishops held "secular courts of pleas," and, in particular, the archbishops of Canterbury, who, on their own estates, had all jurisdiction, spiritual as well as civil, to the exclusion of the king himself. In "all the lands of the Church of Canterbury," the king's jurisdiction was confined to the king's highway, and to three pleas—namely, obstructing that road by breaking it up; secondly, obstructing it by throwing timber across it; and thirdly, committing murder on it. And as S. Anselm went into exile, and suffered the despoiling of his goods, rather than waive a single right of his Church, temporal as well as spiritual, there can be no difficulty in coming to the

conclusion that Dr. Hook's account of the canon he quotes is a simple absurdity.

In the year 1126, John of Crema, Cardinal of S. Chrysogonus, was in England, and held a synod in which he animadverted severely upon the loose manners of the clergy. Of this legate of the Holy See, Dr. Hook says that he "was more of a soldier than an ecclesiastic, and he carried into private life the licentiousness of the camp" (p. 307). In order to make good this assertion, a story is quoted from Henry of Huntingdon, which has been repeated ever since, without much regret, by those who are never afflicted when they can find a spot in the sun; and Dr. Hook, in order to make the story safe, says, very complacently, "that those who refuse to accept his (Huntingdon's) statement as authentic, gain nothing by their refutation of it. The story was one which could be believed of the legate, and it was believed, because the authorities are unanimous in speaking of his incontinence, avarice, and general misconduct."

Now, if it can be shown that this story is untrue, something surely will be gained: one count in the indictment against the legate must be abandoned, and there will ensue a certain amount of suspicion that the other charges of "avarice and general misconduct" might also disappear. The "authorities are unanimous." That may be true; but the authorities resolve themselves into one, Henry of Huntingdon, who undoubtedly lived at the time, but who was an earnest defender of clerical licence, being himself, it is said, the son of a priest. Roger of Hoveden took the story from Huntingdon and in Huntingdon's words: so did the other authorities whom Dr. Hook alleges; some of them not even being born at the time of the legate's visit, and the latest of them living in the fifteenth century. But there are other writers who do not relate the story; and as they lived at the time, their silence is not without meaning, because they do not forget the council or the legate's censures upon the careless and undisciplined clerks. Whether the "story was one which could be believed of the legate" or not, admits of no question, for it evidently has been believed; but there are three versions of it, and these versions are inconsistent one with another. Huntingdon's version of the story is one, that of the annals of Winchester is another, and that of Matthew of Westminster is a third. The annals of Winchester say that the bishop of Durham, accused of many sins, laid a snare for the legate at Durham, and, succeeding in it, escaped the punishment he expected. According to Huntingdon, the scene is laid in London. Matthew of Westminster, who had received another form of the jest—for jest we believe it was—says that the

legate excused himself on the ground that he was not a priest but a corrector of priests; whereas Huntingdon says that the legate had said mass that morning, by way of aggravation of the sin.

In addition to the silence of Simeon of Durham, of the continuator of Florence of Worcester, and especially of the Saxon Chronicle, we have evidence that, in spite of Huntingdon, the cardinal-legate left a good name behind him, and that the tale was either not known or utterly discredited for more than forty years. Gilbert Folliot, the uneasy bishop of London, who resisted S. Thomas, and evaded the monitions of the pope in his zeal for the king, having occasion to speak of John of Crema, and of his legatine visit to England, does so in terms utterly inconsistent with the story of Huntingdon, and which leave no doubt that Folliot either had never heard the tale, or, if he had heard it, had treated it as what it was—a loose jest, current among men not very careful of speech. The legate had, according to Folliot, successfully accomplished his mission, “not by malediction, or by threatenings, but by sound teaching and holy exhortations; he sowed benedictions, and of benedictions gathered in the harvest.”*

We disbelieve the tale, and though the silence of particular writers be in itself no evidence against any fact recorded by even later historians, we cannot in a case like this look upon that silence as unimportant; and then we have three versions of the tale—there may be more—and it comes originally from a tainted source, from a man who, though an archdeacon bound by his office to see that the clergy within his jurisdiction led lives worthy of their vocation, omits no opportunity of speaking his mind about the laws against clerical laxity, and that in a sense hostile to all discipline. Dr. Hook is ready to doubt the story told by William of Malmesbury, and repeated by the “authorities” generally, that Lanfranc suggested to the Conqueror to arrest Odo, not as the Bishop of Bayeux, but as the Earl of Kent, because he can hardly make up his mind to believe that Lanfranc’s fame would be increased by it. But as he cares nothing for the good name of popes and legates, any story is good provided it redounds to their discredit. Huntingdon certainly did object to the laws of the Church prohibiting the marriage of the clergy; but it does not follow that he would

* *Cremensis ille Johannes diebus nostris in partes has a sancta Romana directus Ecclesia, regni consuetudines in quibus jam senuerat, immutavit. Quod non maledictis aut minis, sed doctrina sana et exhortationibus sanctis obtinuit. Benedicens seminavit, de benedictionibus et messem fecit.*—*Folliot, Ep. i. p. 283, ed. Giles.*

invent a lie for the defamation of the papal legate. If we grant that he believed the story, we need not grant that it was ever more than a ribald jest, current among certain ecclesiastics to whom a bad joke was dearer than the honour of the Holy See.

Blunders and prejudices of this kind may, however, co-exist with a general accuracy in the main points of a story, for every author is liable to mistakes. A book is not necessarily valueless as a history because even many errors may be found in it, and we should not be disposed to censure Dr. Hook on this ground. We propose, then, to test these "*Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*" in another way: we shall not urge the innumerable errors which may be fairly ascribed to accident—always supposing that Dr. Hook knew something of the men and events he described; but only those which he may have committed with his eyes open. In other words, the question is this: Has Dr. Hook dealt fairly with his readers? He professes to have taken certain authors for his guides, and further than these we shall not travel, for we propose to show that these authorities on whom he affects to rely have been contemptuously set aside, and that they are referred to only as blinds to conceal the unwarrantable liberties taken with notorious facts of history.

S. Anselm appears to have incurred the Doctor's grave displeasure, for nothing that he did seems to have been well done. Accordingly, we hear of Anselm's—the title of saint is always omitted—"perverseness;" Anselm's "insolence;" he is said to be "impracticable," and to labour under a "want of tact;" then, again, he is "fanatical," which in Dr. Hook's eyes is a great sin. Such is the notion that this writer permits himself to entertain of one who not only was the greatest man of his day, as the world counts greatness, but is now numbered with the saints in the calendar of the Church: one who to his high sanctity united high natural gifts; of a life blameless before men, as it was precious in the sight of God; a great doctor, but simple as a child; elevated in station, but humble as one of his own monks; patient, gentle, forbearing, but withal bold and fearless in the cause of Truth. Even Dr. Hook perceives something of all this, though he does not know the meaning of the words he uses, when he says, "*Anselm was a Papist*" (p. 243).

There is a vein of profaneness running through this most offensive book, and he who reads it cannot help praying that Dr. Hook may never be tempted to write the *Lives of the Apostles*. He has done for the Archbishops of Canterbury what Strauss has done for the four Gospels. With a flippancy utterly shameless he thus speaks of S. Anselm in his monastery: "*The men revered him, the women loved him, the religious world*

honoured him as a saint, the profane world regarded him as endowed with virtues more than human" (p. 182). Notwithstanding this unanimous testimony, but at which the Doctor laughs, to the unsullied character of a great man, Dr. Hook undertakes to say that his contemporaries were labouring under a delusion. He knows more of the saint than they did, and so he informs his readers that the humble abbot had only "the semblance of humility," and that he was under the dominion of a great sin all the time—"the sin of spiritual pride," unsuspected by himself and "not acknowledged by his admirers."

Not only was the saint thus deficient, but "his principles, as an ecclesiastic, were radically wrong." How this is made out we have not been able to ascertain; and perhaps it is not necessary. The Archbishop, in the eyes of Dr. Hook, is an incompetent and ill-instructed man, whose "ignorance of human nature" brought him into trouble, though it made him a noble prelate, whose name is in benediction for evermore.

During the vacancy of the See of Canterbury, after the death of Lanfranc, "Anselm's conduct with reference to the archbishopric is rather perplexing" to Dr. Hook; but the reason of that perplexity is to be found in the strange appreciation of the saint which his biographer has adopted. In short, S. Anselm does all he can to avoid the honour which all the world destined for him; and this is the "perplexity" in which the Doctor sees no light. The Abbot of Bec, though invited to England, and though perhaps his presence was necessary on account of matters connected with the abbey he governed, refused to cross the Channel; nor could he be persuaded to leave Bec till he had a message from the Earl of Chester, who desired to be helped by him in his last agony. That earl was a benefactor of Bec, and had a claim upon S. Anselm such as saints have never disowned; and of this visit and the reasons why it was made, Dr. Hook has the effrontery to write: "He was after this *assailed on his weak point*: the earl's salvation might depend on his receiving spiritual consolation from so holy a man" (p. 188).

S. Anselm was chosen archbishop by the king; and the election was a sort of tumultuous acclamation of all the bishops about the Court; but the saint refused his consent. The king made pressing entreaties; the prelates used force, and carried, rather than conducted, him to a church, where *Te Deum* was sung for the election, and where, according to Dr. Hook, S. Anselm "fainted away," but of which fainting there is no earlier record than that contained in the volume before us. He adds, "Notwithstanding his unwillingness to accept the archbishopric in the first instance, Anselm exerted himself to obtain the necessary consent to the completion of the appointment"

(p. 193). This is an insinuation that S. Anselm's repugnance to accept the archbishopric was a pretence; and that he was really a consenting party to the election, although he resisted the bishops, and was carried, as it were, against his will to the church, where the announcement of his election was made to the clergy and people. Dr. Hook, who discovered the "spiritual pride" of the meek abbot, is equally sagacious here; and would have us believe that, once elected, S. Anselm not only made no further difficulties, but even "exerted himself" to remove all impediments that others might put in the way. To this view of the facts we are able to oppose the direct assertion of S. Anselm, to whom on this as well as on other subjects we do not hesitate to give more credit than to his biographer, who can know nothing of the matter, and who has not taken the trouble to ascertain what has been long ago recorded. The saint, writing to the Archbishop of Lyons, thus expresses himself: "Before I gave my consent [to the election], I told the king openly that I was on the side of Pope Urban, and opposed to Guibert [the antipope], and for six months did and said all I could short of sin that I might be let off. At last, through the fear of God, for many reasons I was forced to yield with regret to the command of my archbishop and the choice of all England, and was consecrated."* There may be people who will prefer Dr. Hook's assertion, who can know nothing of the matter, to the plain testimony of S. Anselm; and to such, if such there be, we have nothing further to say.

But before the saint consented to accept the vacant archbishopric, he required the restitution of the lands of the Church, which William Rufus had seized to his own use; the recognition of Urban the Pope, which Rufus had hitherto delayed; and the due observance of justice towards the archbishop. Upon this, Dr. Hook, measuring all things by the standard of his own times, says: "The king appointed a committee, consisting of the Bishop of Durham and Robert Earl of Meulan, to consider the demands" (p. 193). Now, there is nothing of the kind recorded, and a committee of two persons is not a usual matter. The truth is this, that when S. Anselm had represented to the king what he required of him, William sent for the bishop and the earl, and requested the saint to repeat his demands in their presence. He did so; and the answer was finally given

* Antequam præberem assensum, palam dixi me favere Domino Papæ Urbano et Guiberto adversari: et feci et dixi per sex menses, quod potui sine peccato, ut dimitterer. Tandem timore Dei, ob multas rationes, coactus, subdidi me dolens præcepto archiepiscopi mei, et electioni totius Angliæ, et sacratus sum.—(Ep. iii. 24.)

through the king's council, for Rufus was not really an absolute monarch.

William having recovered from the sickness which frightened him into the surrender of the estates of the Church of Canterbury, by the appointment of a successor to Lanfranc, repented as soon as his health was re-established, and began to feel his way back to his former life. Though he had promised S. Anselm the restitution of all the lands held by Lanfranc on the day he died, and perhaps at the time had some vague notions of keeping his word, he now applied to the archbishop for his sanction of certain illegal dealings with those lands which had taken place during the vacancy. Some tenants of the see had died without heirs, and their lands had escheated to the archbishopric. William, whose respect for law was never strong, undertook to give those lands away, to be held, indeed, of the Church, but as hereditary fiefs; and all this without waiting for the consent of the superior lord, who was the archbishop. He asked S. Anselm to sanction what he had done, but the saint said he would not; he must have the see as Lanfranc left it, or not at all; and he was the more ready to insist upon this because he hoped to escape from the responsibilities of an archbishop. Rufus would willingly have allowed him to retire, had not the clamours of the people proved too much for him, and he was compelled to withdraw his claim; but he never forgave S. Anselm for this act of courage; and this was the beginning of troubles.

Dr. Hook slurs this over in the following words: "The estates *had been let* while they were in the king's hands, and he was urged to maintain the rights of his tenants" [they were not his tenants]. "He applied to Anselm to make some allowance, but he did not take offence when Anselm refused" (p. 196). The king had given the lands away to be held in *feodum hereditarium jure tenendas*. William claimed the right to appoint heirs to men who in dying had left none.* Dr. Hook thinks he can gloss over the iniquity of the king by saying that the archbishop was asked to "make some allowance," when he was in reality asked to accept for tenants of the Church men of whom he knew nothing, except that they were retainers of Rufus, and therefore not likely to be very faithful vassals of their lord.

The Red King had promised, according to Dr. Hook, to "restore the estates which are acknowledged to belong to the Church." This is the way in which he describes the answer of his committee, but it is not the answer which was really given.

* Vult asserere se posse juste quos vult eorum hæredes constituere.—(Ep. iii. 24.)

It is necessary for this writer to make ambiguous what is plain, in order to enable him to smooth over the conduct of the king. The answer of the "committee" was that the king would "restore all the lands of which the Church was seized while Lanfranc lived."* There was no ambiguity here, and there could be no difficulty in ascertaining what lands Lanfranc held, who had been dead just four years. Let us listen again to Dr. Hook:—"The archbishop elect was subjected necessarily to some inconvenience in resuming the estates of his see, and Ralph Flambard, not yet Bishop of Durham, *was prominent among the malcontents*; but so far as the king was concerned, he directed that Anselm should be instituted in all the property and privileges possessed by Lanfranc: he even went further, for Lanfranc held the city of Canterbury in fee, and William Rufus now made it an allodium to the cathedral" (p. 195). It does not appear why there should be any inconvenience "necessarily" to be endured in the resumption of lands which the king had promised to restore. The "inconveniences" were the work of the king himself, and would never have existed if he had allowed matters to proceed as he had promised. Ralph Flambard's deeds cannot be got rid of by calling him a "malcontent." This man went down to Canterbury to meet S. Anselm, and on the very day on which the archbishop—not yet consecrated—made his entry into the city, already his own, and where he was received with joyful acclamations,—this man, we repeat, sent expressly by the king, troubled the joy of that day by impleading the archbishop in a matter with which Rufus had nothing whatever to do. Ralph Flambard was the agent of the king, sent by the king to Canterbury expressly to disturb the archbishop, and to molest him in the exercise of his admitted rights. And as for the donation of the city of Canterbury, which Dr. Hook seems to represent as occurring at this time, that was effected six months before; and it is simply dishonest to represent it as having been made at this time. Ralph Flambard was not a "malcontent," if by that term we are to understand a man moved by his own grievances, real or feigned, but the agent of the king; and the true disturber of the peace was, not Flambard, but William the Red himself,† who repented of his good deeds—never being known to have repented of an evil one.

After the consecration of the saint, some of his friends per-

* Terras de quibus Ecclesia saisita quidem fuerat sub Lanfranco, omnes quo tunc erant, tibi modo restituam.—*Eadmer*, lib. i. p. 37, ed. 1721.

† A rege missus quidam nomine Ranulphus, regie voluntatis maximus executor.—*Ibid.* p. 37.

suaded him to make a present of money to the king, who was engaged in preparations for subduing Normandy. The archbishop offered five hundred pounds of silver—no inconsiderable sum from a prelate whose see had been in the king's hands for four years, and ruthlessly dilapidated by the most cruel extortions. The red savage accepted the gift, but his trusted friends told him it was too small ; and the gift was rejected.

Dr. Hook is somewhat disturbed at this story, and insinuates that as the bishops now held their lands on the " same tenure as the laity, it may be that a relief was expected from them. But whether this were the case or not, the archbishop was expected to make an offering to the king, to which Anselm demurred, lest it should be represented as a simoniacal transaction, and a report got abroad that he had purchased the archbishopric" (p. 196).

Now, the archbishop never " demurred," but consented at once, when the matter was represented to him ; nor was it till after the rejection of his gift that he expressed any fear of its being misinterpreted. He was even willing to purchase the favour of the king with the money, if it could have been done, and would have given more money again and again if he could thereby have been enabled to execute his office in peace. But now that the gift was scorned, because the king thought it too little, S. Anselm also drew back, and resolved never again to give William a single penny of the money of the Church ; and at a later time he told the bishops that, if the king's favour was to be purchased with money, he would give no money for it ; and he never did.

William was probably not disappointed in the archbishop, because he knew what manner of man he was ; but he was angry with him, and perhaps with himself for having given up the See of Canterbury, when he might have held it, and received the rents of its many manors. The fear of death wrung the archbishopric out of his unwilling hands, and the only repentance recorded of him is that which followed on the appointment of S. Anselm. That act of justice, brought about by the terrors of impending judgment, seems to be the only thing he ever regretted seriously while he lived ; but he did a malignant penance for it : he persecuted the archbishop with unrelenting hate, and sold for money or for service every other bishopric that became vacant in his reign.

Dr. Hook is a liberal man, though nominally a conservative, with his instincts all on the wrong side. He hates, to all appearance, the supernatural principle, and prefers the expediency of a debased statecraft to the rule of right, and the despotism of the civil power to the liberty of the Church. " In

the personal disputes between the kings and the archbishops," he says, "I am inclined to take the most favourable view that circumstances will permit of the sayings and doings of the former; *the kings were generally right in principle*, though placing themselves in the wrong by the ungovernable temper which was their curse, if not an hereditary mania" (p. 68). This being the principle of this writer, we need not be surprised at the prejudices, ignorances, misrepresentations, and dishonesties which abound in his work. He apologizes for William Rufus, whom all historians have abandoned as a reckless villain; whose character, unredeemed by any virtue, was stained with enormous sins, such as by common consent are never named among men; the oppressor of his subjects, and the savage tyrant who knew no law but his own will. Foxe, though unfriendly to S. Anselm, as to one not "sufficiently acquainted with the justification of a Christian man," could not venture to defend Rufus, who was "so immeasurable in his tasks and takings, in selling benefices, abbies, and bishoprics, that he was hated of all Englishmen." But Dr. Hook, who professes other and higher principles than those of the rabid buffoon commonly called the Martyrologist, is quite as unfair in his treatment of S. Anselm, and less just in his appreciation of the Red King.

"When we have respect to the miseries entailed upon the country by the misunderstanding and controversy between the primate and the sovereign, we cannot but wish that the former had acted with more worldly wisdom, and that the latter had found a friend such as his father possessed in Lanfranc. William, offended with Anselm, and not finding *friendship and paternal allowance where he sought it*, threw himself back upon his dissolute companions, resumed a life of vice, rescinded his promise of good government, and through his needs, his passions, or his indifference, became a tyrant himself, and did not discountenance, perhaps encouraged, the oppressions of his underlings" (p. 198). True to his system of misrepresenting S. Anselm, Dr. Hook had said before: "The wonderful power which Lanfranc possessed in the management of men is evinced in the fact, that so long as he lived William Rufus was, to a certain extent, kept under control" (p. 167).

Lanfranc remonstrated with Rufus once for not keeping the promises he had made, and received for answer, "Who is there that can perform all he has promised?"* and we may

* Quis est, qui cuncta quæ promittit, implere possit?—*Eadmer*, lib. i. p. 33.

judge from this how amenable William was to the counsels of a prelate to whom he owed his throne. During Lanfranc's life the whole wickedness of Rufus was not visible: that is true, but there was quite enough of it, and more than Lanfranc liked, who was compelled to look on in silence and be thankful it was no worse. But Dr. Hook throws all the blame of William's wicked life on S. Anselm, whose lack of "worldly wisdom" "irritated" the king and goaded him into sin. His horrible morals and his iniquitous reign were "occasioned by his having been brought into contact with Anselm" (p. 186), and were not the spontaneous effusions of his own nature, which, though it was that of "a bad man," was still that of "one who, like his father, could have been managed."

To this singular theory we have nothing but facts to oppose. The tyranny, injustice, and wickedness of Rufus were let loose long before Anselm became archbishop; the See of Canterbury was plundered when he was at Bec; Ralph Flambard was not the creature of S. Anselm; and it was not S. Anselm who let the royal and ecclesiastical farms to the highest bidder, and re-let them again when another came who offered more. William's sins were crying to Heaven for vengeance when S. Anselm was in Normandy, and probably knew nothing of the ruthless proceedings of the Red King.

The terrors of death surrounded this savage at Gloucester in the beginning of the year 1093, and compelled him, as we have seen, to relax his hold on the archbishopric; but no sooner had these terrors passed away than he relapsed into his former courses—desperate and reckless; for he was vexed at heart because he had consented to the nomination of S. Anselm. Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, with his usual "want of tact," as Dr. Hook would say, spoke to him of his sins, and advised him to lead a better life for the future. Rufus having recovered his health, and loving his sins with his whole soul, swore by the Holy Face of God that God should never find any good in him for the evil He had brought upon him. The prisoners whose release he had ordered were kept in prison, and those who had gone out were to be made fast again; and the evil deeds he had done before his illness seemed to be good in comparison with the deeds he did after his restoration to health. The life of Rufus is something terrible: the man hardened his heart like Pharaoh, and made sin his delight. He was successful in all he undertook; he defeated his enemies; when he wanted to cross the Channel the very winds seemed to go down at his presence, and the rough sea to become smooth for him. God seems to have given him up to a reprobate mind; and his friends observed that he went to rest every night a worse man

than he was in the morning, and that he rose a worse man than he was when he went to rest the night before.*

This evil man "rescinded his promises of good government" some months before S. Anselm even consented to accept the archbishopric, the "dissolute companions" were never dismissed, and the "life of vice" was never abandoned. Dr. Hook had the proof of this before his eyes, if he read the authorities he quotes; but he does not like to speak the truth about Rufus, because he has made up his mind to blacken a saint.

In the spring of the year 1094, William went over to Normandy, and while he was waiting with his army at Hastings, S. Anselm made an earnest effort to check the immoralities by which the land was deluged; he represented to the king the state of the nation, and, among other things, said: "'There are many abbeys in England without abbots, and the consequence is that the monks, released from the restraints of discipline, are leading dissolute lives, while the better sort † are deprived on their death-beds of the comforts of religion. I do therefore advise you . . . that you straightway appoint abbots.' . . . The king could not stand this. The abbeyes alluded to were exempt from episcopal jurisdiction; he therefore turned fiercely upon the archbishop, exclaiming: 'What is that to you? are not the abbeyes mine?' . . . The archbishop heeded not the angry man, but with irritating calmness, he replied: 'Yours they are as their advocate to protect and defend, but not to attack and rob: they are the property of God, and are designed, not to pay the expenses of your wars, but to support His ministers.' . . . 'This conversation,' said the king, 'is offensive to me'" (p. 202).

This conversation between S. Anselm and Rufus we have taken from Dr. Hook, and, on the whole, his account of it may be trusted, but the commentary upon it is most strange: that the king was offended, "not so much by what was said, as by the insolent way of saying it."

This most wearisome writer not only accuses S. Anselm of "insolence," and that without proof, but defends indirectly the rapacious deeds of Rufus, when he says that the abbeyes "were exempt from episcopal jurisdiction." But that exemption most certainly did not transfer their revenues to the Crown, or justify William in refusing the monks permission to elect their abbots. In the religious establishment to which the Dean of Chichester

* Eadmer, Hist. Novell., lib. ii. ad fin.

† This is another instance of the author's carelessness; "*the better sort*" is an interpolation: "Monachi, relicto ordine, per luxus sæculi vadunt et sine confessione de hac vita exeunt."—Eadmer, i. p. 39.

belongs, there are certain benefices called "donative," exempt from the jurisdiction of the ordinary, but the patron does not enjoy the revenues of the vacancy; and if he did, it is not probable that the Dean would approve of his doing so, though he makes light of the like act in William Rufus.

When William had returned from Normandy, the archbishop went to Gillingham—Dr. Hook calls it Illingham—near Shaftesbury, where he was staying, and told him that he must go to Rome for the pallium. Rufus asked him from whom he meant to receive it? The archbishop replied, "From Urban." Rufus answered, that he had never acknowledged Urban, and that it was the usage of his father and of himself to allow none in England to acknowledge a pope not acknowledged by the king. As this was a very serious matter, Rufus added, with great simplicity, that he who should rob him of this prerogative might as well take the crown also from him. The archbishop heard this with amazement, and told Rufus that it was no concern of his, because he had already informed him that he had acknowledged Urban before he left the abbey of Bec to become Archbishop of Canterbury.

At this time (as we have seen) there was an antipope in the world, supported by the emperor, who had set him up in the lifetime of S. Gregory VII. This man was Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, who continued to afflict the Church from June, 1080, till September, 1100. After the death of S. Gregory in 1085, more than two years before the death of William the Conqueror, and four years, all but one day, before the death of Lanfranc, the English nation was in a state of passive schism. It is a stain upon the reputation of Lanfranc, and an evidence of the tyranny of the Normans at the Conquest, of far deeper significance than all the rapine and cruelty laid to their charge. During the vacancy of the See of Canterbury, after the death of Lanfranc, and before the consecration of S. Anselm, neither the bishops nor the king took any trouble in the matter; and thus, even in the eleventh century, we see a foreshadowing of the final isolation of the kingdom from the fold of Christ.

The archbishop could not lawfully administer his see without the pallium, and he therefore proposed to go in person to Rome, in order to receive it from the Sovereign Pontiff. William Rufus had no ground of complaint; for he knew that the archbishop must apply for the pallium, as he knew also that S. Anselm at Bec had already, with the French and Norman prelates, recognized—what they had never doubted—the pontificate of Urban II. Dr. Hook says of this, "Anselm was clearly in the wrong." He thinks that the saint should have required the king to acknowledge Urban II., or at least to make his

choice between him and the antipope. This passes our comprehension: for S. Anselm, knowing and believing Urban to be the Vicar of Christ, could not propose an act of sin to Rufus, even as an alternative; and it might be retorted upon Dr. Hook that the acceptance of S. Anselm, who had already owned Urban, as Archbishop of Canterbury by William Rufus, was equivalent to the royal recognition of the pope, inasmuch as the saint had told him that he was a subject of Urban.

"As Anselm," says the Doctor, "while Abbot of Bec, had accepted Urban as his pope; if the king had chosen Clement, the archbishop might have resigned. But he had no right whatever to make his election irrespectively of the royal authority" (p. 205).

Now, upon Dr. Hook's own showing, S. Anselm became archbishop as the subject of Urban II.—Rufus knowing it also—and could therefore not withdraw from his allegiance without sin. The resignation of the see was impossible, for he could not resign without the consent of the pope; and even Dr. Hook cannot suppose that Urban would accept a resignation made under such circumstances—that is to say, for the express purpose of disowning his authority. Even Rufus himself would have refrained from pressing the resignation, because it would require the recognition of the pope, whom he had hitherto refused to acknowledge. Dr. Hook thinks that the secular power should decide who is, or who is not, pope, and blames S. Anselm for disregarding the royal authority; forgetting that the saint when he made his profession of obedience to the pope was not a subject of Rufus in any sense: he was the subject, if at all, of Robert Duke of Normandy, the elder brother of the Red King. Even if Rufus had the right which he claimed, S. Anselm had not encroached upon it, for he was a subject of Urban before he came over to this country; and we should be sorry to suppose that even Dr. Hook imagines that allegiance to the Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ, could be shaken off by merely crossing over from Normandy into the country governed by William Rufus.

The doctrines of the Dean of Chichester on this point are curious; but as they are entirely his own, he is compelled to disregard facts in order to give them an air of plausibility, and to pervert the language of others in order to make them support his gratuitous statements. He thus explains himself at p. 184:—"It was not denied that the pope was the successor of S. Peter, and that as such he had some undefined rights in all national churches. But because these rights were undefined, the king of England asserted and maintained his own right to be over all persons, and in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil,

within his dominions supreme. It was a law of the Church of England that no letter from the pope might be promulgated by any authority without the royal sanction, and that no bishop might, without the same sanction, implead or punish any vassals of the Crown: it was a law of the Church of England that no prelate should leave the kingdom, even if summoned by the pope, unless the royal permission were first obtained: and it was left to the king to decide, when there happened to be more than one pope in existence, which of the rival candidates should be acknowledged by the English Church and State." If these were the principles of the Church of England in the eleventh century, several questions arise to which Dr. Hook has, apparently, given no thought; and we, too, must be content with passing them by while we make some observations upon this most singular statement. In the first place, it is a notorious fact, and admitted by the Doctor himself, though he seems to be unconscious of it, that the Conqueror and his son Rufus were not supreme even over all laymen within their dominions. They were not supreme, certainly, over ecclesiastics, because they could not arrest them for any crime, still less could they punish them. The vassals of the great barons owed nothing to the king either in the way of tribute or of obedience. The barons took the oath of fidelity, and did homage to the king for their lands, but the vassals of the barons were not bound to the king, and these would have fought against him without scruple, if their immediate lord had required them to do so; just as the barons of Normandy, vassals of the duke, made war upon the King of France, the lord paramount of the fief, whenever the Duke of Normandy, King of England, had a mind to fight. Nor is it possible to show that the English sovereigns had a different authority in the kingdom from that of the French monarch in his own, the feudal law being the law by which kings and barons regulated most of their public and private affairs.

The vassals of the great barons obtained what justice they could in the courts of their immediate lords, and never troubled the king's judges with their appeals. If any man had a claim against another who was not the subject of his own lord, he went to the court of the baron who was the lord of the defendant, and took his chance of justice there. Nor was it till the reign of Henry II. that appeals could be carried out of the barons' courts to the court of the superior lord.* When Henry II. made a law to that effect, the barons murmured; but as it was principally directed against the courts of eccle-

* Roger de Pontiniac, p. 131.

siastics, bishops and abbots, they apparently submitted, in the hope of escaping themselves, while the prelates were to be robbed of their jurisdictions. It was not an easy matter to enforce this law of Henry, for even he himself hesitated to apply it. A murder was committed on a manor belonging to the Church of Canterbury; but, as it lay within a hundred the jurisdiction of which belonged to the abbey of S. Edmunds, the archbishop's officers refrained from prosecuting the murderers in the court of the abbot, and proposed to prosecute them in their own. The abbot was not to be cheated, and, having first complained to the king of a charter said to have been granted by him, under which the archbishop's officers intended to proceed, but which Henry denied, sent his men-at-arms, eighty in number, seized the murderers, and confined them in the prison of the abbey. It is true that the archbishop maintained that the jurisdiction was his own; but, as the abbot had taken possession of it, nothing was done, and the rights of the abbey were saved; though the king was appealed to, and entreated to decide between the litigants, he never did so.* If Dr. Hook had read carefully the "original report" of the trial on Penenden Heath, he might have saved himself from making this wild assertion; for it is there recorded that "the King of England has no customs in any of the lands of the Church of Canterbury, three only excepted;" and that Lanfranc "ought justly to have many customs in all the lands of the king and of the earl"—i. e., the Earl of Kent. If also he had read the book of "that great and good man Ranulf de Glanville" (p. 547), even in the English translation from which he seems to quote, he would have learned that there was one plea at least beyond the jurisdiction of the king. Glanville says in the writ, which he probably settled himself, that a cause of bastardy could not be tried in the king's courts.† And at a later time, when the civil encroachments had grown, and the jurisdictions of the bishops had been curtailed, matrimonial and testamentary causes were still beyond the competency of the king's judges.‡ The kings of England were certainly not in all causes and over all persons within their dominions supreme, even under the ruthless rule of the Conqueror and his immediate successors.

As for its being "a law of the Church of England that no

* Chron. Jocelini de Brakelond, p. 38.

† Ad curiam meam non spectat agnoscere de bastardia.—(Lib. vii. c. 14.)

‡ Si de testamento oriatur contentio, in foro ecclesiastico debet placitum terminari, quia de causa testamentaria, sicut nec de causa matrimoniali, curia regis se non intromittit.—Fleta, b. ii. c. 57, § 13.

papal letters should be promulgated, no vassals of the Crown punished in the spiritual courts, no prelate leave the kingdom without the king's consent," such assertions are without meaning. These were not "laws of the Church" before the Conquest, nor were they held to be binding on any man after the Conquest. The king from time to time attempted to enforce these principles, but without success; and certainly, at the period of which the Doctor is writing, there was no pretence of observing these laws. Giraldus Cambrensis tells a story of himself, as archdeacon, being about to enforce the law of the Church on a refractory baron, who pleaded this law of exemption from censure in vain. The archdeacon excommunicated him, and brought him to his senses without reference to the king, and in manifest contempt of this "law of the Church of England." But, in fact, Eadmer, the very authority from whose writings the Dean of Chichester, zealous for the supremacy of the State, gathers the knowledge of these propositions, does not say that they were laws or maxims of the Church of England, but customs which the Conqueror wished to introduce and enforce in this country, and against which the Church protested. Henry II., as well as Henry I., made every effort to subdue the prelates, and compel them to accept this yoke, but failed in the attempt: S. Anselm went twice into exile rather than submit, and S. Thomas gave up his life for the same end.

In describing the contest with Rufus about the recognition of the pope, the Doctor claims for his client—who "with justice represented the support of Urban as a breach of Anselm's oath of fealty"—the right of deciding who should be the pope acknowledged in England. In the passage just quoted, the Dean represents this pretension of the king as a right appertaining to the Crown when there should be "more than one pope in existence." That, however, was not the claim of the Conqueror. The claim of William I. was, as the Doctor represents it in p. 145, "that the clergy should not be permitted to acknowledge *any one as pope* until the royal consent had been first obtained," whether there was an antipope or not. Now, if a claim of this kind could be made good, the Church of England was absolutely at the mercy of the king, and the royal supremacy complete from the Conquest. But such a claim was never allowed; for after Henry II., who once attempted in Normandy to revive it, but without success, we hear no more of it, and it certainly never was "a law of the Church of England," nor even admitted to be a right of the Crown, for even the kings themselves must acknowledge the pope, or cease to be members of the Church.

Rufus charged S. Anselm with a breach of the oath of allegiance; for, according to him, obedience to the pope was inconsistent with the obedience due to the State. The saint demurred to the royal opinion, and demanded that the question should be referred to the bishops and the barons; adding, that if it should be decided against him, he should quit the kingdom till Rufus acknowledged Urban. The bishops and the nobles, with S. Anselm and Rufus, met at Rockingham, where the bishops sided with the king, and even renounced their obedience to their metropolitan. Dr. Hook is satisfied with the bishops, "who behaved extremely well throughout this affair;" but is, as usual, dissatisfied with the saint, who made the question "one of religion and not of politics." The straightforward and honest conduct of the saint in going at once to the root of the matter, abstaining from all chicanery and even special pleading, which he might lawfully have used, is extremely distasteful to Dr. Hook, and so he asks this question: "Was it perversity, stupidity, or craft, which thus resolutely misrepresented the case?" If there be any misrepresentation here, it is all Dr. Hook's; and if ever there was a "question of religion," most certainly this was one.

Some of this historian's reticences here must not be left unnoticed. "The bishops were consistent throughout," we are told; but nothing is said of the advice given to the king by the bishop of Durham, and from which the other bishops did not dissent. This prelate said that S. Anselm's arguments could not be refuted, because they rested upon the Word of God and on the authority of blessed Peter. "Nevertheless," said he, "my opinion is that he should be coerced by force, deprived of the staff and ring, and then expelled the realm, if he will not acquiesce in the king's will."* This may be consistency on the part of this prelate, but it is not "behaving well;" and a man must be very far gone in liberalism before he can approve, as Dr. Hook does, of the conduct of bishops who thus counselled force against a prelate, their superior, whose cause they admitted to be right when they said that the defence of it was irrefutable.

S. Anselm was now deserted by the bishops, who withdrew from him, renouncing their canonical obedience—though, in fact, they could not do it—and taking openly the side of the king against the primate. The people, when they heard of this, spoke of one as Herod, of another as Judas, of a third as

* Verum mihi violentia videtur opprimendus; et si regiæ voluntati non vult acquiescere, ablato baculo et annulo, de regno pellendus.—*Eadmer*, i. p. 42.

Pilate, and so on; and even the barons seemed ashamed of the bishops, for when Rufus asked them to renounce S. Anselm, they refused, on the ground that they were Christians.*

Rufus, unable to defeat the archbishop, and heartily despising the cowardly prelates, who were more subservient to him than the secular barons of his court, now sent two of his chaplains to Rome to ascertain the facts about which he had raised doubts in England; in the words of Dr. Hook, "to make choice of the most compliant of the two pretenders to the papal throne. They fixed upon Urban" (p. 212). In this assertion, as usual, this most careless writer is wrong. Rufus was no doubt foolish, because folly is allied to sin; but he was not so silly as to suppose that he could safely make choice of the anti-pope, simply because that person adopted his views. The chaplains were instructed to ascertain the truth—*scire veritatem hujus rei*; and then, having obtained access to the pope, they were to persuade him, if possible, to send the pallium to the king for the use of the Archbishop of Canterbury. By this trick Rufus intended to oust S. Anselm, and to put another in his place. The pope did not fall into the pit dug for him; but sent the pallium for S. Anselm by the cardinal bishop of Albano, who travelled with the king's chaplains. This prelate, saying nothing about the pallium in his keeping, never spoke to anybody on the road but in the presence of these chaplains. Rufus received him, and taking his own wishes for granted—namely, that the pallium had been sent, not for S. Anselm by name, but for the archbishop—acknowledged Urban, and then demanded the deposition of S. Anselm. To his great astonishment, he was told that his request could not be granted, and thus all his violence and cunning ended in nothing but his own humiliation, and the delivery of the pallium to S. Anselm, from whom he had purposed to filch it.

William, disappointed and made more savage by this unexpected issue of a deep plot, as he thought, sought and found another occasion of quarrelling with the primate. The soldiers furnished by S. Anselm from his fiefs did not please Rufus; so he sent a message to the saint to say that he should be summoned to answer in his court for the inefficiency of the troops supplied by the Church of Canterbury. Dr. Hook, without any authority other than the assertion of William, says that the soldiers "were not able-bodied, neither were they properly equipped," and then indulges his wrath against the archbishop,

* Nos qui Christiani sumus ejus magisterium, dum hic vivimus, declinare non possumus.—*Ibid.* p. 43.

whose "negligence was culpable," and who "insulted the king." Of this there is no proof, and it may be passed by. The saint knew there was no justice to be had in the court of William, and therefore gave no answer; but when the court met, nothing could be done because the archbishop appealed to the pope. Dr. Hook is now beside himself, because "at a loss to decide whether there was more of effrontery or of simplicity" in this proceeding. William, of course, refused permission to the archbishop to go to Rome. The archbishop, however, persisted in his demand, and nothing more was said about the soldiers or their equipment.

S. Anselm persevered in his intention to go to Rome; the king and the bishops resisted, for they were afraid of the interposition of the pontiff; and the saint needed advice and directions how to exercise his office in a country where the men in power, bishops and nobles, were so careless of their Christian obligations. "He was still unable to perceive," says the present historian, "that the question did not relate to theology, but simply to the duty of a subject to his sovereign" (p. 221).

There is a depth of baseness in the principles upheld by this writer into which it is awful to look: the abject servility to the sovereign, the sacrifice of all right to might, the ignoring of conscience, and the degradation of the episcopal dignity lead straight to the abjuration of Christianity, and to the supremacy of secular government over all persons and in all causes. It is nothing less than the doctrine of the infidel Hobbes, and identical with the principles now deliberately admitted by the promoters of revolution throughout Europe, who eliminate the supernatural from the calculations of their political arrangements.

S. Anselm sent for the bishops who were usually with the king, and demanded counsel of them. They asked leave to confer together, and after some discussion they sent two of their number to ascertain the wishes of the king—for they had no counsel of their own—and then addressed the primate in these words: "We know you to be a religious and holy man, having your conversation in heaven. We, on the other hand, embarrassed by relatives, and by the manifold affairs of the world which we love, confess that we cannot rise to the heights on which you live, nor laugh at the world with you. But if you will come down to our level, and walk in our ways, we will take care of you as we do of ourselves, and make, if necessary, your affairs our own. If, however, you regard God alone, as you have chosen to do, so far as we are concerned, you shall be left alone for the future, as you have been hitherto.

We will keep our allegiance to the king.”* This strange speech is not to be found in Dr. Hook's book, but instead of it we have this, as the sum and meaning of what the bishops send: “The bishops had a reverence for his office, his character, his learning, and his piety, *but they were practical men*. It was really a political question. They refused to regard it in any other light, and on such a point they were prepared, as patriots, to stand, not by the pope, but by their king” (p. 221).

It is not worth while to discuss anything with a man who can thus deal with facts and principles, but it is as well to remind people that these doctrines are infinitely wicked. They not only furnish the sanction for arbitrary power, and justify every oppressor—striking at the heart even of civil virtue, and breaking up the foundations of secular polity—but they are simply antichristian; because the conscience of no man is respected, and because divine revelation is made to give way to State convenience, and patriotism becomes a cloak for every conceivable sin. Dr. Hook does not shrink from the issues. When the bishops had done speaking, the saint replied to them, “You have spoken well: go you, then, to your lord; I will keep near unto God.” But Dr. Hook must have another fling at the saint, and, drawing upon his own disordered imagination, writes: “Anselm, *with the unconscious insolence* which attributed corrupt motives to every one but himself, and assuming the tone of a martyr, exclaimed, ‘Then go you to the king; I will abide in God.’”

There is no difficulty now in accounting for the omission of all reference to the speech of the bishops: if Dr. Hook had published it, even he could not have written the words just quoted without exciting the contempt of his readers. S. Anselm showed no temper of any kind, still less was he guilty of “insolence,” nor was there any necessity to “attribute corrupt motives,” because the bishops avowed them: they were honest enough to admit “corrupt motives,” and that they could not adopt those of the saint. They preferred deliberately their own convenience to the law of God, and said so without disguise, shamelessly confessing how little they cared for anything but for the favour of a royal ruffian, stained with sins unnamed, from whom some of them had bought their bishoprics with money. After this, S. Anselm obtained leave to go to Rome, for the king was ashamed of himself though the bishops were not, but Rufus said he must take nothing with him. “I will go naked, and on foot,” replied the archbishop.

* Eadmer, lib. ii, p. 47,

Dr. Hook is discreetly silent now, and says not a word of the treatment of the archbishop at Dover, where his baggage was examined by William's agent, to the astonishment of the people, who execrated the insult offered to the meek and unresisting primate.

We now proceed to that part of S. Anselm's history which occurred in the reign of Henry I.—for Rufus died while the saint was in exile,—who, on the return of the archbishop, “desired measures to be taken for his investiture.” Henry was “anxious to restore the forfeited property of the Church by reinstating Anselm in his barony” (p. 238); but the barony never was forfeited, and there was no necessity for investiture, because the saint had been in possession of it even before his consecration. It is true Rufus had seized upon the estates of the Church when the primate quitted England for Rome, but it is not true that the seizure was legal, or that a forfeiture had been incurred. Moreover, Henry himself did not pretend that there was any forfeiture in the case; for he restored the lands of the Church, though he did not succeed in his scheme of making that restitution depend on the homage which he claimed of the primate. S. Anselm in Rome had learned more about the question of investitures, and on his return determined to execute the canons. The Norman kings hated all canons, and insisted upon the observance of their customs. The king sent an agent to Rome to ask for a modification of the law which prohibited lay investitures. The answer came, and it was a plain refusal; but that was no reason with the king why he should not act illegally. So he told the saint that he must quit the kingdom, or submit to acknowledge himself to be archbishop by the king's will. The saint replied that he would do neither, and Henry was unable to proceed further. So he sent again to Rome.

“The embassy consisted of the Bishops of Norwich and Lichfield, and at the head of it was placed the archbishop elect of York, all eminent men devoted to the cause of the Church of England” (p. 248). One of these “eminent men,” the Bishop of Norwich, was unlucky in his journey, for in the neighbourhood of Lyons he fell into the hands of a gentleman of good principles, even if his practice required amendment, who compelled him to take an oath that he would do nothing against S. Anselm when he got to Rome. The poor bishop took the oath, and also paid a good deal of money for his liberty. These ambassadors were instructed to use very strong language to the pope, and they were not ashamed to do so, but they came back without gaining their end.

Henry now summoned the primate to observe his customs

or quit the kingdom, ignoring the embassy. S. Anselm demanded to see the apostolic letters. "He may see his own," replied the king, "but mine he shall not see." S. Anselm said he should keep his own till they could be compared with those addressed to the king, and the latter sent word back that he would have nothing to do with letters—"the archbishop must conform to my will without any subterfuge." They who heard this imagined that Henry's claims had been allowed by the pope; but after a time S. Anselm showed the letters he had received, and those were fatal to the king's pretensions. Upon this, the bishops, "eminent men devoted to the cause of the Church of England," said that the letters were so, no doubt; they had nothing to say against the letters; but the pope, in a private audience—from which the primate's agents were excluded—had conceded to the king the privileges he sought. When they were asked to explain how it was that the pope, having written the letters produced, had not also written to the effect of what they now stated, the "eminent men" had an answer ready. The pope was afraid other kings might hear of such letters, and make claims like those of Henry. This story of the bishops was not told till after S. Anselm's letters had been shown, and is not consistent with the conduct of the king, who kept back the letters he had himself received, not because they were useless, but because he did not know of the testimony of the bishops.

Dr. Hook treads very tenderly here, but he is not embarrassed: walking in the ways of "eminent men devoted to the cause of the Church of England," he adopts the story of the bishops, as "consistent with the traditional policy of the court of Rome," though the alleged act was not "a dignified proceeding on the part of Paschal." If then it reflected no credit on the pope, it would be well if Dr. Hook had considered what sort of "proceeding" it was on the part of the bishops, should the story prove to be an invention of those "eminent men." The "verbal communication brought by the envoys to the king ought not to have been divulged: but they were provoked to make it known, that they might counteract the effect produced by the publication of the letter received by Anselm" (p. 249). The Doctor does not tell us how the matter could have been settled without divulging that communication, if it had been really made.

Henry, pretending to believe the bishops, attempted to enforce his customs, and invested two of his clerks with the bishoprics of Salisbury and Hereford: the former was given to his chancellor, the latter to his larderer; but the larderer died, and the see was given to Reinelm, the queen's chancellor. He then ordered the primate to consecrate them, together

with the bishop elect of Winchester. S. Anselm consented to consecrate the latter, because he had refused to accept investiture from the king; but this was not sufficient for Henry, and S. Anselm would do no more. So Gerard, Archbishop of York, was requested by the king to do in the province of Canterbury what the primate refused. "The Archbishop of York, a sound Anglican, was willing to officiate," says Dr. Hook; and he is correct; but people in general may have doubts about a "soundness" which enables a bishop to intrude into the diocese of another, violating canons and defying the pope. Reinelm, the queen's chancellor, when he saw what was in preparation, sent the ring and the staff back to the king, and was expelled the court. The Bishop of Winchester also was struck with compunction on the day of his consecration, and refused to proceed, though Gerard of York and other prelates were vested for the function. Roger of Salisbury seems to have been without fear, but he was not consecrated, for the prelates left the church, and the scandal was not consummated. The Bishop of Winchester was banished, and his property confiscated. Dr. Hook has not thought it prudent to mention these facts.

S. Anselm, perplexed by the pertinacity of the bishops who had returned from Rome with the "verbal communication"—for they spoke with confidence, and offered to appeal to the pope himself for a confirmation of their story,—sent his own agents to the pope at once, that he might know what to do. He did not believe the bishops, but was at the same time unwilling to contradict them in public. "In the middle of Lent," says Dr. Hook, "the messengers whom Anselm sent to Rome returned. *As the king must have expected*, they stated when interrogated by him that the pope adhered to his brother Anselm in every respect" (p. 252). Now, if the "king must have expected" the answer that was given to the primate, he must also have known that "the sound Anglican" had told a lie, and that the "eminent men devoted to the cause of the Church of England" were not equally devoted to the cause of truth. This admission of Henry's knowledge and expectation, made by his apologist, throws a shadow over the king so dark and hateful that it ought to have frightened the Doctor into a little more carefulness, and, what is not less worthy of note, throws a light upon the story of the bishops that no reticence can extinguish. Their tale was a pure invention, and Henry knew it to be so as well as they did. This is not all the proof of their shameless perversion of facts. We have a letter of the pope himself—and even Dr. Hook will probably hesitate before he asserts that the Sovereign Pontiff did not tell the truth—in which he says that the story of the bishops was "what we never spoke, what

we never imagined—*quæ nec diximus eis, nec cogitavimus.*” More than this, he actually excommunicates the bishops for telling that lie.* It is perfectly incredible that the pope should punish these “eminent men” if they had not been guilty of dishonesty, in deliberately misrepresenting the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff.

Henry persisted in refusing to read the letters that had been brought from the pontiff to S. Anselm, and yet, unwilling to quarrel openly with him, he requested him to proceed in person to Rome. S. Anselm went, but before the saint reached the Apostolic See, William de Warelwast had preceded him as the ambassador of the king, and obtained an audience of the pope. S. Anselm was present with the cardinals, and William made a long harangue in favour of his master, uninterrupted by the archbishop, who never spoke; for he had come for the pope’s decision, not to defend himself. Paschal also listened. William de Warelwast proceeded, and as he thought that he had made an impression, by way of finally settling the matter, he said, “I wish you all here present to understand that the king my master will not tolerate the loss of his right to give investiture; no, not if it were to cost him his kingdom.” At this point the pope broke silence, and said, “If, as you say, your king will rather lose his kingdom than abandon this claim, you must know—I say it in the presence of God—that Pope Paschal, for the ransom of his own head, will never allow it.” Dr. Hook is pleased at this point to call the pope “a weak, proud, irritable man,” but he cannot alter the facts. The pope absolutely refused to concede the investiture, which was the real question; he offered, however, to tolerate some of the customs, but not those of lay investiture—*interdictis omnino ecclesiarum investituris*—in order if possible to bring Henry to a sense of his duty: he also suspended for a time the sentence of excommunication which the king had incurred.

Dr. Hook says that William de Warelwast “carried all his points,” and that S. Anselm left Rome “thoroughly disgusted.” Eadmer, who was with the saint, says the clean contrary! Of Warelwast he says that, utterly unsuccessful, he begged the pope to write a civil letter to Henry, lest he should seem to have done nothing.† And further still, Warelwast, at

* *Episcopos autem qui veritatem in mendacio invocarunt, ipsâ veritate, quæ Deus est, in medium introducta, a beati Petri gratia, et a nostra societate excludimus, donec Romanæ ecclesiæ satisficiant et reatus sui pondus agnoscant.*—*Eadm.* iii. p. 66.

† *Quod quia nequaquam facere potuit, persuasorias literas regi deferendas, ne nihil videretur egisse, a Papa obtinuit.*—*Ibid.* iii. p. 67.

Lyons, when he told the saint that he could not return to England, prefaced his speech with these words: "I thought that our cause at Rome might have had a different issue." Dr. Hook is somewhat independent of his authorities, but it will not be easy to win credit for his statements when they are contradicted by eye and ear witnesses, and even by his own account; for he tells us that William de Warelwast addressed S. Anselm thus: "While I hoped that our affairs at Rome would take another turn, I delayed to mention the communication which I have to make to you from the king" (p. 255). The truth is, and Dr. Hook in his hurry had forgotten it, that Henry had determined not to permit the archbishop to return to England except upon his own terms, which he hoped to extort from the pope. Failing in his object, his agent now reveals to the primate the king's resolution. It is clear from this that the pope did not give way, and that Dr. Hook misleads his readers when he tells them that William de Warelwast "carried all his points." A still further proof of the failure of the embassy is to be found in the fact, which Dr. Hook does not conceal, that "the king immediately confiscated the archbishop's property." Nor is the Doctor to be trusted when he says that the archbishop "left Rome thoroughly disgusted." Of this there is no trace in Eadmer; but as it was necessary for the Doctor's story to say so, and as it costs him but little trouble to depart from his authorities, nobody need wonder at this assertion; and those who put faith in the Doctor's book will think that, if it is not true, it ought to be so.

The saint remained at Lyons. Henry, now master at home, laid his hands on the Church of Canterbury; and, unable to satisfy his necessities out of the revenues of the primacy, sent his tax-gatherers into the houses of the parochial clergy, and extorted from them heavy sums of money. The king's government of the Church became so oppressive that those "eminent men" who had falsified the pope's words saw the mistake they had made, and wrote a penitent letter to the archbishop, entreating him to return. They had had enough of the royal supremacy, and were now ready to suffer some of that persecution which they had occasioned to the primate, if only he would return and share it with them. But the archbishop would not re-enter the country till Henry consented to respect the canons of the Church. At last the patience of the saint was rewarded, and Henry, whose sentence of excommunication had been so long and so frequently suspended, knowing it must come at last, consented to waive his customs and to submit to the orders of the pope. He agreed to abandon his claim to invest the bishops and abbots with the ring and staff, and the Holy

See, which never seeks the humiliation of anyone disposed to be honest, however partially, consented to allow homage to be done for lands held of the Crown, and so saved the honour of Henry, for which he was anxious, without abandoning the principle for which S. Anselm had gone twice into exile.

S. Anselm had lived three-and-thirty years in a convent, and was an old man of sixty before great troubles fell upon him. The evening of his life was a continued storm, and the throne of Canterbury was a veritable Calvary on which he had no rest. He lived among men who would not know him, and who demanded services of him which he could not render. The bishops stood in array against him, and the kings withstood him; all the powers of the State were used to thwart him; but he never yielded, and was never discouraged. Worn out with labours, in the seventy-sixth year of his age, and in the sixteenth of a stormy pontificate, he lay down on his bed within the monastery of Canterbury, awaiting the summons of his Master, whom he had so faithfully served and so ardently loved. He was sick unto death, but he had no bodily pains, save that of the burden of seventy-five years, when, on Wednesday in Holy Week, while the monks were singing matins in the great church of Canterbury, one of his attendants took up the book of the Gospels, and read aloud the Passion which was to be sung at mass that day. The reader had got to the words "You are they that have remained with me in my temptations," when it was perceived that the archbishop breathed more slowly. They who were around him, seeing that the end was nigh, took him from his bed, and, having clad the Primate of All England in sack-cloth, laid him on the floor of his cell, strewn with ashes. The monks hastened in from the church, for their father was dying, and the saint went to his everlasting rest at the dawn of the day, April 21, 1109.

Dr. Hook, having misrepresented the life of the archbishop, misrepresents also his death. He shuts his eyes to the account given of it by Eadmer, and out of his "own inner consciousness," like a German philosopher, describes in his own way, and from his own stand-point, a scene the beauty of which he is unable to comprehend, and the mere facts of which he seems unwilling to render correctly. The words are the words of a Protestant dean; they are not the words of Eadmer*: "Early in the morning, at the time when matins were chanted in the

* These are: "Jam fratrum conventus in majori ecclesia matutinas laudes decantabat, et unus eorum qui circa Patrem excubabant, *sumpto textu Evangeliorum*, legit Passionem coram eo, qua ipsa die ad Missam legi debebat."—*Vit. S. Anselm. ad fin.*

cathedral, one of those who watched at his sick-bed *opened the Bible*, and read to him a portion of the Scripture appointed for the day" (p. 276).

Henry, on the death of the saint, confiscated all the archiepiscopal estates, and converted the revenues to his own use. Dr. Hook doubts "whether he exceeded his constitutional rights, according to which, although he was entitled to the income, he was bound to spend it on religious and charitable uses. . . . *We may presume* that the revenues of the see were assigned to the chapter of Canterbury to complete the great works in progress in Canterbury Cathedral" (p. 284). Eadmer is referred to as the authority for some portion of this singular statement; and it is nothing surprising to find that the original historian is simply contradicted. Dr. Hook "presumes" that the revenues of the see were paid over to the chapter, while Eadmer states with great distinctness that the king treated the revenues of the see as his own, and that the monks were spending only their own money on "the great works." In this matter all the credit that is due to the king is the credit of not robbing the monks also during the vacancy of the see. The "constitutional rights" began with William Rufus, for the Conqueror preserved the fruits of the vacancy for the incoming prelate; and it may be more than doubted whether the precedents of Rufus could become law so soon. If this were so, it would be to the profit of the king not only that vacancies should occur frequently, but that they should be prolonged; and an unscrupulous king, according to this doctrine of the Dean of Chichester, might by degrees usurp all the revenues of the Church. In fact, Wicliffe suggested such a process in the fourteenth century, and we know not how Dr. Hook could object to it, for it would be strictly within the constitutional rights of the Crown as he interprets them throughout this volume.

During the vacancy of the see, it was administered by the Bishop of Rochester, who, says the Doctor, "had *some* claim to act." This is a very inadequate description of the convention concluded between Lanfranc and his suffragan; for he had *every* claim possible, and neither the monks of Christ Church nor the bishops of the province could set it aside. After receiving the revenues of the Church for five years, Henry yielded to the "remonstrances which assailed him from all quarters." This phrase is probably intended to conceal the "monitions of the pope" spoken of by Eadmer; and Ralph, the Bishop of Rochester, was chosen to be the successor of S. Anselm. It was an irregular act: the pope was not consulted, and was ignored both by Ralph and the monks of Canterbury; for they installed the new bishop before he was released from the bonds

by which he was held to Rochester. Dr. Hook passes over this matter, probably because he approved of it, but his words are curious: "Upon the translation of the Bishop of Rochester to the See of Canterbury, the king had permitted the chapter to notify the election to Paschal, who was at that time pope, and to demand the pall. The application was made in a free and independent spirit" (p. 292). It appears from this that Dr. Hook imagines that the application for the pallium was a matter over which the king had some control, or that it was a matter which might have been dispensed with if the king had refused to permit the monks to make that application. Nor need we be surprised at this, for the Dean of Chichester has not even the faintest notion of the meaning of spiritual power. To him the State is supreme, and the violent measures of the Conqueror and his sons present no difficulties to the easy conscience of the Doctor, who sympathizes with kings, barons, and judges, and blames the lives only of confessors and martyrs.

We cannot tell in what spirit the monks of Canterbury applied for the pallium, but we can tell what their language was, for the letter is preserved by Eadmer, and in it they "supplicate" the pope to grant the pallium,* carefully concealing every symptom of a "free and independent spirit," lest it should issue in a refusal. And they had good reasons to be afraid, for Ralph, their archbishop, had surrendered that for which S. Anselm had so laboriously contended: he had disregarded the express prohibition of the Holy See. The monks were anxious for the pallium, and a long delay might have been fatal; for if Pope Paschal had heard what had taken place, he would in all probability have sent Ralph back to Rochester. It seems that, in violation of the agreement made during the episcopate of S. Anselm, Henry had resumed the investitures, and Ralph was weak enough to accept from him the ring and the staff on his appointment to the See of Canterbury.†

This prelate, whose elevation to the See of Canterbury was so irregular, and whose conduct was so displeasing to the pope, had but a troubled reign, notwithstanding his alliance with the king. Upon the death of Thomas II. in 1114, the canons of York elected Thurstan, one of the king's chaplains, with the king's consent, to the vacant see. Thurstan, taking with him the Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishops of Durham and

* *Modis quibus possumus, supplicantes, ut . . . confirmetis, et ei pallium . . . transmittere dignemini, ne Sanctitate Vestra aures pietatis sue precibus nostris, quod Deus avertat, non inclinante.*—*Eadmer: Hist. Nova.*, lib. v. p. 87.

† *Illum per annulum et pastorem baculum investivit.*—*Wendos.* ii. p. 191.

Lisieux, applied to Ralph for consecration. The Archbishop of Canterbury consented on one condition: that Thurstan should make a profession of obedience to him and his successors in the See of Canterbury. Thurstan replied that he placed himself in the pope's hands as to that matter, and Ralph, to the astonishment of those who heard him, rejoined, "Without that profession I will never consecrate you, even if the pope himself should order me to do so." After this Henry took up the quarrel, and called upon the archbishop elect either to go into exile or to acknowledge the subjection of York to Canterbury. Thurstan in this dilemma said that it was a serious thing for him to incur the king's displeasure, and still more serious to offend against God and the Church of Rome; "but that I may do neither," he added, "I prefer to resign." He did resign; but as he had accepted the election, which was complete, even in the eyes of those who considered the king's sanction necessary, it was not in his power, not in the power of the chapter, not in the power of Henry, to make that election null, and Thurstan's resignation was of no value till it was accepted by the Sovereign Pontiff. This seems to have been perfectly understood, for the chapter of York not only never proceeded to another election, but pressed Thurstan to accept the see, and the king made no attempt to find a prelate who would sacrifice the right of his Church to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Pope Paschal refused to consider the resignation as lawful, and required Henry to restore the archbishop, seeing that he had been set aside unjustly, and, in reality, by violence. Paschal died in January, 1118, and the dispute continued under his successor Gelasius, who required the two prelates to present themselves before him that he might decide between them. Ralph evaded the summons, and persuaded the king to interpose. Gelasius died in January, 1119, and was succeeded by Calixtus II., who reprimanded the Archbishop of Canterbury for his conduct; and, as he had called a council at Rheims, he desired Henry to allow the two prelates to attend. Henry was afraid to refuse, and, according to Dr. Hook, "the royal consent was given reluctantly." The friends of the Archbishop of Canterbury say that Thurstan promised not to accept consecration from the pope, but Thurstan's own friends say nothing of the kind; and their silence probably represents the truth, for if Thurstan had been bound by any such promise, he must have consented to waive his claim. Dr. Hook describes his going to Rheims as his own act, consented to by Henry: if it were so, he was not likely to make such a promise, because it would be equivalent to an abandonment of his rights; but as his going really was the fruit of the Papal letters to Henry and to Ralph, and as Henry

could not detain him, because he was afraid of censure, it seems most improbable that he should have bound himself by such a promise, as his opponents allege against him.

"The king and the archbishop had no confidence in Thurstan, and did not rely on his word" (p. 290). This is Dr. Hook's explanation of the subsequent proceedings: Ralph did not attend the council, lingering on the road, but with the king's concurrence sent messengers to the pope, and begged him not to consecrate Thurstan. We believe that Thurstan made no promise, and that these messages to the pope were the consequences of Thurstan's resolution, and not any want of confidence in him or of reliance on his word.

The answer of the pontiff we will give in Dr. Hook's words: "Let not the king suppose that I will act otherwise than reason demands in the matter on which he treats; or that I have any desire to lower the dignity of the Church of Canterbury. The king and the archbishop were satisfied; and yet it is impossible to doubt that Thurstan and Calixtus were at this very time acting in concert, and with a predetermination to violate or evade their stipulations and promises" (p. 291). It is true that the partizans of the Archbishop of Canterbury maintained that Thurstan had promised Henry not to accept consecration from the pope; but there is not even a shadow of ground for maintaining, as Dr. Hook does, that the pope himself gave any promise, or anything like a promise, not to consecrate the persecuted prelate. The pope, in consecrating Thurstan, did nothing "to lower the dignity of the Church of Canterbury," because the consecration of Thurstan was not the exclusive right of Canterbury; and the consecration did not decide the dispute about the profession of obedience to that church, or deprive Ralph of his right, if he had the right, to exact it at any subsequent time.

John, Archdeacon of Canterbury, and nephew of Ralph the archbishop, who absented himself from the council on the plea of illness, when he heard the pope announce his intention to consecrate Thurstan, "in the name of his metropolitan protested against this violation of the laws of the Church universal, this infraction of the most sacred promises" (pp. 291, 292). John protested, no doubt, but he said nothing of the laws of the universal Church, and he probably knew too much of the matter to say anything about the "infraction" of promises never made. He certainly claimed for his uncle the exclusive right to consecrate Thurstan; but such a claim was perfectly ridiculous against the Sovereign Pontiff. The pope did consecrate Thurstan, but, in doing so, expressly reserved the right of Canterbury to the profession, if it could be established, so

that Ralph had no reason to complain. Dr. Hook, confounding the consecration with the profession—whether from ignorance or design is immaterial—gives vent to his feelings in the following words about Pope Calixtus: "And then, 'like a tall bully who lifts his head and lies,' he not only proceeded to consecrate Thurstan, but conferred upon him, so far as in him lay, the privilege of not being subject to the See of Canterbury, but of holding equal rank in his own province" (p. 292). To this there can be but one answer: that the whole is an invention. The pope never promised anybody that he would not consecrate Thurstan; and the consecration was made with an express reservation of the rights of Canterbury. The rights of that church were not touched, and Ralph prosecuted them himself with undiminished energy after the consecration, taking care, however, not to appear either as plaintiff or defendant in the pope's presence, where alone the question could be finally set at rest. It is most likely that Ralph had grave misgivings about the justice of his claim, because he never attempted to enforce it in the only way in which it could be enforced. He preferred leaving it to the king, who banished Thurstan from his dominions, and confiscated the possessions of his see. The pope had offered to decide the question between the two archbishops; but neither Henry nor Ralph took any measures to further the trial. They preferred violence to a legal process, and did not make any pretence to justice. When Calixtus II. remonstrated personally with Henry, and even entreated him to permit the Archbishop of York to return to his see, that sovereign's only reply was that he had pledged his word never to permit him to return. The pope offered to release him from his promise. Henry, who was a notorious breaker of his word, said that it would be unseemly for him to accept a dispensation, and that his violation of a promise such as the one he had made would be a bad precedent, because others might follow his example, and keep faith with none. Henry's conscientious reverence for a wicked pledge made only to himself, and of the same nature with the oath of Herod, failed him soon afterwards; for when Calixtus II. threatened to excommunicate him, and to suspend the Archbishop of Canterbury, the exiled prelate was allowed to return, and the clergy and people of York received him with all demonstrations of joy.

Thurstan maintained his ground; and, as the question was never carried before the pope, he made no profession of obedience to Canterbury. His example, followed by his successors, led to the enfranchisement of York; and the northern primate ceased to be subject to the southern. Thurstan founded and endowed the great abbey of Fountains, and was a

great and generous benefactor of religious houses. He resigned in his later years the See of York, and entered the monastery of the Cluniacs at Pontefract, where he died. He fought a good fight for his Church; and though he innovated upon the old practice, the Holy See did not censure him, and perhaps even encouraged him; for the independence of York had then become necessary, because the prelates of Canterbury were not, under Henry and Stephen, men of the spirit of S. Anselm, but unhappily too ready to sacrifice the liberties of the Church to the caprices of the sovereigns, who dealt with the bishoprics and the abbeys as they did not dare to deal with the fiefs of the baronage.

In the great contest between S. Thomas and Henry II., Dr. Hook takes the side of the latter, and shows the former no mercy. The saint is "violent," "proud," "overbearing," of an "ungovernable tongue," and "to the last even filthy expressions would escape from his lips" (p. 480). It is perfectly useless to examine the whole story as told by Dr. Hook, for it is a tissue of misrepresentation from beginning to end. We shall, therefore, confine our remarks to only two points.

"Immediately after his consecration, Becket caused it to be notified to the king that the Archbishop of Canterbury was no longer his chancellor. It is anything but pleasant to read of the cool and deliberate manner in which Becket abruptly terminated his friendship with the king. *His conduct appears to be heartless in the extreme.* He quitted the service of Henry with as little regret as he had left that of Theobald" (p. 388). S. Thomas served Henry faithfully while he was his chancellor, and gave the king to understand that the service must cease the moment he became Archbishop of Canterbury. Dr. Hook himself admits it; thus he writes: "If we place any reliance on history, we must believe that Becket forewarned the king that in forcing him upon the chapter of Canterbury he would lose a servant if not a friend" (p. 385). Moreover, at his consecration, the bishops of the province demanded and obtained for S. Thomas a full release from all secular obligations, even to the rendering in of his accounts as chancellor. The Church of Canterbury required its archbishop to be free: Henry's son, with the chief justiciary, granted the release demanded, and Henry himself subsequently ratified the act. The archbishop on the day of his consecration was completely free of all secular burdens, and Henry knew it as well as he did. It was simply an act of courtesy on the part of the archbishop to inform the king that he was no longer the chancellor. If Henry expected him to retain the chancellorship, as it is said, he had no grounds for doing so; like other schemers, he

overreached himself, and was bitterly disappointed. There was nothing "heartless" in the act, and the "friendship with the king" need not have come to an end. We do not know that he resigned his office without "regret," but it is most probable that the resignation was not without anxiety, because the archbishop knew well the temper of the king, and had even gone so far as to prophesy evil of the inevitable separation which would be the result of his election to the vacant See of Canterbury. It was necessity that compelled the resignation, because S. Thomas knew that he could not serve two masters, quite as well as the bishops of the province when they demanded his release from the secular obligations he had contracted as chancellor, and which release Henry need not have granted if he wished to retain S. Thomas in his service.

If he quitted the service of Theobald without regret, nobody had a right to complain except Theobald himself; and that he had no ground for complaining is clear from Dr. Hook's own account of the matter; for he says that "on the accession of Henry II. the archdeacon was removed, at the instance of Theobald himself, from the court of the archbishop to that of the king, and he became Thomas the Chancellor" (p. 364). The separation of the archbishop and the archdeacon was the work therefore, not of the latter, but of the former. Thomas did not seek the office of chancellor, but it was Theobald who recommended Thomas to the king, and thus occasioned the separation which, according to Dr. Hook, exhibited such extreme heartlessness on the part of the saint.

This insinuation of heartlessness is followed by another accusation against the martyr for which there is not only no foundation, but not even a colourable excuse, because it is contradicted by the authorities on whose alleged testimony it is made. Henry, after the resignation of the chancellorship, "demanded why the archbishop had not resigned also his lucrative archdeaconry? Why he did not it is impossible, at this distance of time, to say. Henry insisted upon the resignation, and Becket was obliged, though reluctantly, to give way." Mr. Robertson also, in his "Biography of S. Thomas," but with less excuse than Dr. Hook, for he seems to have read the authors he quotes, is equally severe upon the archbishop; and it is apparently from him that Dr. Hook derives his knowledge. "While, however, he was so eager to divest himself of the chancellorship, he was in no hurry to give up another preferment which to many eyes appeared less reconcilable with his new dignity—the archdeaconry of his own diocese; nor was it until after much delay and much urgency on the king's part that he was persuaded to resign it." (Robertson, p. 64.)

S. Thomas, then, is charged with retaining the archdeaconry together with the archbishopric, and with a certain amount of obstinacy besides. The archbishop held many other preferments, but of these we hear nothing; the presumption is, therefore, that they became vacant on the day of his consecration. Admitting for a moment that the archdeaconry also did not in the same manner and at the same time cease to be in his hands, there is one question to be asked—What had the king to do with it? Henry never pretended to any right of patronage in the archdeaconry, and at that time the kings of England did not claim to have the disposal of the preferments held by a clerk raised to the episcopate. Nobody has yet explained this alleged interference of the king with patronage exclusively in the hands of the archbishop, and in a matter which did not concern him in the slightest degree whatever; for it was nothing to him whether the Archdeacon of Canterbury existed or not in a person distinct from that of the primate, or even existed at all. The truth of the matter is this: the archdeaconry became vacant on the day on which S. Thomas was consecrated, but it was not filled at once because Henry begged the archbishop to delay the appointment. More than this, he had to make very urgent entreaties to the archbishop, for it was not an ordinary request. S. Thomas had no reason for not filling up the vacant dignity, but Henry was anxious that it should be given to a man upon whom he might rely; and so it was done. The archbishop gave way, and, willing to be at peace with Henry as long as possible, conferred the archdeaconry, at his request, on Geoffrey Ridel, who proved to be one of his most relentless enemies, and one of the most unscrupulous tools of the king.

The account of this matter is furnished by Ralf de Diceto, and is as plain an account as can be found anywhere: "Thomas, archdeacon of Canterbury, raised to the archbishopric, for a long time, at the most pressing solicitation of the king, delayed the transfer of the archdeaconry. He transferred it at last according to the king's petition, but did not recover the king's favour."* Dr. Hook is unable to say why the appointment was so long delayed, or rather why the archbishop did not resign what he did not hold. There is neither mystery nor difficulty in the matter: the very person from whom we learn that the archdeaconry remained vacant so long informs us also at the

* Thomas ex archidiacono Cantuariensi sumptus ad archiepiscopatum, ad instantissimam regis postulationem, diutius distulit archidiaconatum transferre. Transtulit tandem sicut rex petiit, sed gratiam regis, &c.—*Trysden, Decem Scriptores*, 534.

same time, and in the same place, that the whole delay was owing to the pressing entreaties of Henry, who had his own views in the matter. The archbishop may have been "reluctant" to give way to the king, but not in the sense of Dr. Hook: he did not resign "reluctantly," for the vacancy took place when he was consecrated; but it was quite possible that he may have been reluctant to give the archdeaconry to Geoffrey Ridel; and if he knew the man then half as well as he knew him afterwards, there is nothing strange in the protracted vacancy, or in the reluctance of the saint to bestow so important an office on a man who made it the business of his life to thwart his archbishop and to sacrifice the liberties of the Church he was bound to defend.

Archbishop Baldwin finds some favour in his biographer's eyes, though he was "animated by feelings of mistaken piety," *i.e.*, "love to God" (p. 563). His life is thus begun: "Gervas, who, with strong party prejudices, wrote the life of Baldwin, honestly commences his brief notice of him with expressing his intention to say all the evil of the archbishop that he could" (p. 540). Gervas, if an honest biographer, was certainly an unwise one, if he made such a declaration as this, for he could scarcely hope to find readers that would trust him. However, Gervas did not say what the Dean of Chichester attributes to him; and we must add this to the many blunders which adorn the pages of this work. Gervas said, "I am compelled, against my wish, to record, not the good, but the great evil" which Baldwin did to the Church of Canterbury.* Gervas had but one quarrel with the archbishop—his hostility to the monks of Canterbury; and even this he records on compulsion, as a faithful historian, and not out of deliberate malice, as Dr. Hook would have us believe.

In the account given of Baldwin, an attempt is made to lessen the horrors of the death of Henry II., not only without authority but in direct contradiction of the authority alleged. Henry was one of the great men of his day—great in his wickedness, unscrupulous, false, cruel, and lustful. He had no pity on his own children, no tenderness for his wife, who, however, probably deserved but little; he was a man without any sense of shame, an oppressor of his subjects, perfectly careless about his promises, and a deliberate persecutor of the Church. He abjured the Pope, and murdered S. Thomas; and was one of

* *Proposui et promisi de regibus et archiepiscopis prospera dicere, et bona quæ Cantuariensi ecclesiæ fecerunt, lectoribus aliqua nuntiare. Sed cum facta Baldewini video, non bona sed mala multa referre compellor invitus.*—*Twysden*, 1675.

those great ones of the earth of whom there are many examples, from the first persecutors down to that unhappy man who, on the desolate rock in mid ocean, realized in the modern world the fable of Prometheus, upon whom the vulture preyed and wore out his life.

"Towards the close of his life, Henry II. was desirous of retaining Baldwin near his person; and the archbishop laboured assiduously and faithfully, in conjunction with the Archbishops of Rouen and of Tours, to awaken the king to a sense of his sins, with the view of leading him to repentance and to the Saviour. How far they were successful will not be known till that day when the secrets of all hearts will be revealed. *But the prelates were persuaded that, to a certain extent, they had succeeded; and the mere fact of his seeking for spiritual advice and consolation is an indication of the softening of a heart almost broken by a succession of sorrows*" (p. 562). Everybody who reads this will be glad to believe that it is true; but the authority of Dr. Hook, who can know nothing of the matter, is an inadequate foundation for the very faintest hopes. Of the last end of Henry II. we do not venture to speak, and we confine ourselves to the facts as they are recorded. The most favourable testimony to Henry's repentance is that of Hoveden, who says that he was carried into the neighbouring church in his last agony, where he confessed his sins, and was absolved by the bishops and clerks then present. But he had said previously that the king, when the mortal disease had shown itself, cursed the day of his birth, and imprecated the curse of God and his own upon his children, and never withdrew it, though importuned to do so by the bishops and priests who were with him.* According to Hoveden, bishops and priests were with him when he departed this life, but as Hoveden is not known to have been in Normandy at the time, his account is of less value than that of Giraldus Cambrensis, who was then on the continent, and upon whose authority Dr. Hook seems to rely for the statement he has made, for he refers to him and to him only. But, as usual, there is an irreconcilable difference between Dr. Hook and the author he quotes. Giraldus Cambrensis begins by calling attention to a strange fact: that at the last moment, Henry, who throughout the year had been attended by two or even three archbishops and by five or six bishops, was now alone, and not even a priest was in his train. Cambrensis certainly, but whether truly or not is a question we do not wish

* *Maledictionem Dei et suam dedit filiis suis, quam nunquam relaxare voluit, licet episcopi et cæteri viri religiosi eum ad relaxationem maledictionis suæ sapius commovissent.*—*Hoveden*, p. 654, ed. 1601.

Such a man—a pauper of Christ—a beggar, with all those accessories of poverty, so repulsive to the senses and to the sense of our delicate age, has been raised upon our altars within our own very recent recollection; nay, the most aged amongst us had seen the light before he went to his reward. But what the world despises, children and the people love: their instincts are with the Church, and with sanctity. Scarcely had that beggar's soul left his squalid rags for the bosom of his Lord, when infant voices were heard crying in the streets, "E morto il Santo—the Saint is dead;" and all Rome was rushing to honour what remained of him on earth. This was in 1783. Thirteen years previous, that beggar had slept under the roof of a peasant of Dardilly, a village in the south of France, not far from Lyons. The beggar was Benedict Joseph Labré, and the peasant who, for the love of God, gave nightly refuge to the homeless poor, was Pierre Vianney, the grandfather of him who has rendered his humble name for ever famous in the annals of the Church's heroes. Yes, we have seen a saint in our day—the eyes of many of us have seen him, and have recognized him as such. Seldom, perhaps, has heroic sanctity been so plainly manifested as for thirty years was that of the Curé of Ars. Men called him "the relic" while he was yet alive; and Christians visited Ars as they would a holy shrine. Yet he possessed none of those qualities which sometimes make the world forgive a man his supernatural virtues, and admire him in spite of its prejudices: for he was poor in natural gifts—not only unlearned, but devoid of much capacity for acquiring knowledge, without which men judge, and rightly in the natural order, that no great work can ever be achieved. His was, in fact, an intellectual mediocrity which, if not incompatible with excellence, even in the world's estimation, usually marks out for a man an obscure and unnoticed path, and prepares for him an unknown or forgotten grave.

A worthy successor was Jean-Baptiste Vianney of the despised mendicant, who ate the bread of charity under his grandfather's roof, and doubtless left a blessing behind. The Abbé Monnin, the biographer of the Curé d'Ars, knelt at the tomb of the canonized beggar, to implore his help in the work he had undertaken; and we have good reason to thank both for the result. In addition to his own peculiar qualifications for the task, the author possessed the inestimable advantage of close observation, during several years, of the man whose saintly features he portrays, having been sent to assist in the spiritual labours which the extraordinary concourse of pilgrims had multiplied to so prodigious an extent. We should have been glad to see his volumes translated at full length, for we

those great ones of the earth of whom there are many examples, from the first persecutors down to that unhappy man who, on the desolate rock in mid ocean, realized in the modern world the fable of Prometheus, upon whom the vulture preyed and wore out his life.

"Towards the close of his life, Henry II. was desirous of retaining Baldwin near his person; and the archbishop laboured assiduously and faithfully, in conjunction with the Archbishops of Rouen and of Tours, to awaken the king to a sense of his sins, with the view of leading him to repentance and to the Saviour. How far they were successful will not be known till that day when the secrets of all hearts will be revealed. *But the prelates were persuaded that, to a certain extent, they had succeeded; and the mere fact of his seeking for spiritual advice and consolation is an indication of the softening of a heart almost broken by a succession of sorrows*" (p. 562). Everybody who reads this will be glad to believe that it is true; but the authority of Dr. Hook, who can know nothing of the matter, is an inadequate foundation for the very faintest hopes. Of the last end of Henry II. we do not venture to speak, and we confine ourselves to the facts as they are recorded. The most favourable testimony to Henry's repentance is that of Hoveden, who says that he was carried into the neighbouring church in his last agony, where he confessed his sins, and was absolved by the bishops and clerks then present. But he had said previously that the king, when the mortal disease had shown itself, cursed the day of his birth, and imprecated the curse of God and his own upon his children, and never withdrew it, though importuned to do so by the bishops and priests who were with him.* According to Hoveden, bishops and priests were with him when he departed this life, but as Hoveden is not known to have been in Normandy at the time, his account is of less value than that of Giraldus Cambrensis, who was then on the continent, and upon whose authority Dr. Hook seems to rely for the statement he has made, for he refers to him and to him only. But, as usual, there is an irreconcilable difference between Dr. Hook and the author he quotes. Giraldus Cambrensis begins by calling attention to a strange fact: that at the last moment, Henry, who throughout the year had been attended by two or even three archbishops and by five or six bishops, was now alone, and not even a priest was in his train. Cambrensis certainly, but whether truly or not is a question we do not wish

* *Maledictionem Dei et suam dedit filiis suis, quam nunquam relaxare voluit, licet episcopi et ceteri viri religiosi eum ad relaxationem maledictionis suae sæpius commovissent.*—*Hoveden*, p. 654, ed. 1601.

Such a man—a pauper of Christ—a beggar, with all those accessories of poverty, so repulsive to the senses and to the sense of our delicate age, has been raised upon our altars within our own very recent recollection; nay, the most aged amongst us had seen the light before he went to his reward. But what the world despises, children and the people love: their instincts are with the Church, and with sanctity. Scarcely had that beggar's soul left his squalid rags for the bosom of his Lord, when infant voices were heard crying in the streets, "E morto il Santo—the Saint is dead;" and all Rome was rushing to honour what remained of him on earth. This was in 1783. Thirteen years previous, that beggar had slept under the roof of a peasant of Dardilly, a village in the south of France, not far from Lyons. The beggar was Benedict Joseph Labré, and the peasant who, for the love of God, gave nightly refuge to the homeless poor, was Pierre Vianney, the grandfather of him who has rendered his humble name for ever famous in the annals of the Church's heroes. Yes, we have seen a saint in our day—the eyes of many of us have seen him, and have recognized him as such. Seldom, perhaps, has heroic sanctity been so plainly manifested as for thirty years was that of the Curé of Ars. Men called him "the relic" while he was yet alive; and Christians visited Ars as they would a holy shrine. Yet he possessed none of those qualities which sometimes make the world forgive a man his supernatural virtues, and admire him in spite of its prejudices: for he was poor in natural gifts—not only unlearned, but devoid of much capacity for acquiring knowledge, without which men judge, and rightly in the natural order, that no great work can ever be achieved. His was, in fact, an intellectual mediocrity which, if not incompatible with excellence, even in the world's estimation, usually marks out for a man an obscure and unnoticed path, and prepares for him an unknown or forgotten grave.

A worthy successor was Jean-Baptiste Vianney of the despised mendicant, who ate the bread of charity under his grandfather's roof, and doubtless left a blessing behind. The Abbé Monnin, the biographer of the Curé d'Ars, knelt at the tomb of the canonized beggar, to implore his help in the work he had undertaken; and we have good reason to thank both for the result. In addition to his own peculiar qualifications for the task, the author possessed the inestimable advantage of close observation, during several years, of the man whose saintly features he portrays, having been sent to assist in the spiritual labours which the extraordinary concourse of pilgrims had multiplied to so prodigious an extent. We should have been glad to see his volumes translated at full length, for we

can ill spare a single paragraph ; but if abridgment we must have, we cannot speak too highly of the one which lies before us ; though, indeed, to qualify it as an abridgment, would be to do the work injustice. It is rather a reproduction, in a condensed form, of the materials furnished by the Abbé Monnin's biography, interspersed with remarks suggested by the incidents, rather than derived from the original narrative, and possessing many merits and graces of its own.

Most of our readers will probably have perused one or other—many, both—of the works in question ; but the theme is one of such surpassing interest that few, we believe, will be unwilling to linger over it. Yet the very richness and abundance of the matter are embarrassing. To give even a passing notice of all that solicits our regard would be to recapitulate the life of this wonderful man ; we prefer, therefore, to select one special point, and group our principal remarks around it. The following extract from the preface to the English biography will indicate the main object we propose to keep in view :—

It would seem as if God were dealing with us now as He dealt with the world in the beginning of the Gospel. To the corrupt intellectual refinement of Greece and Rome, He opposed the illiterate sanctity of the Apostles ; to the spiritual miseries of this age, He opposes the simplicity of a man who in learning hardly complied with the conditions required for holy orders, but, like the B. John Colombini and S. Francis of Assisi, drew the souls of men to him by the irresistible power of a supernatural life. It is a wholesome rebuke to the intellectual pride of this age, inflated by science, that God has chosen from the midst of the learned, as His instrument of surpassing works of grace upon the hearts of men, one of the least cultivated of the pastors of His Church.

The parents of the Curé d'Ars, Matthieu Vianney and Marie Beluse, were examples of that peculiar stamp of piety which the Catholic faith produces in the cultivators of the soil. Those children of toil, as they bear in their daily life the literal penalty of the fall, and, apart from the influences of grace, commonly exhibit in strong relief the lineaments of the unspiritual nature ; so, also, when they receive the engrafted life of the Second Adam, do they seem to manifest its features in corresponding plain and legible characters. In the Catholic peasant, of all lands, we recognize the same leading characteristics—the same unalloyed genuineness of faith and unconscious simplicity of its expression in the daily habits ; the same richness and generosity of that charity which is its fruit.

In Matthieu Vianney and Marie Beluse these characteristics were eminently conspicuous. She sweet, gentle, affectionate, winning, and withal possessing that true nobility of soul which

religion confers; he of a rougher, hardier mould, but a thoroughly good man, full of that plain and austere wisdom which the pious soul gathers in the fields under the canopy of God's heaven. Jean-Baptiste-Marie was the second of their six children. Many a time did his mother offer him to God and our dear Lady before his birth, and she even dedicated him, by a secret vow, to the service of the altar, if it were the good pleasure of the Lord to ratify the offering. This child of benediction was not left long under the primeval curse: the waters of baptism flowed over his brow before his first sun had set. The same piety which was impatient to make him an heir of glory watched for the first faint dawn of reason to turn the opening soul to God. At eighteen months old he could join his little hands between his mother's, and repeat after her the names of Jesus and Mary. Indeed, grace in him seemed to have taken precedence, and substituted its own breathings and promptings for the instincts or propensities of nature. At three years old he is a little contemplative, seeking out hiding-places wherein to indulge his devotion: he cares not for play or playthings; his recreation is to raise his infant heart to God; rosaries and holy pictures are to him in lieu of toys. Sixty years afterwards he still remembered, with fond affection, the first present he received—a little wooden image of our Lady, from which he would never be parted, day or night. No sanctity without a tender love of Mary: with Jean-Marie it seemed, like the babe's love for its earthly mother, to have come before the use of reason, or, at least, before any conscious reflection. "You have loved the Blessed Virgin a long time?" was a question addressed to him in after years by his assistant priest. "I loved her before I knew her," was the reply.

And this through life was the characteristic of the holiness of this marvellous man: love preceding knowledge; nay, filling its place, and more than compensating for any deficiency of that natural intellectual activity on which many set so inordinate a value. Indeed, there is too great a disposition to regard the reasoning power as the highest faculty in man, and the truths grasped by reasoning as the most exalted attainable by the human mind. But Divine love supplies intellectual light in a far more eminent form, and irradiates a sublimer region of the soul. "Besides the reasoning faculty" (we quote the words of Surin), "God has placed in man another superior faculty called simple intelligence, by means of which, even in the natural order, we conceive the first principles of the most abstract sciences, and, when assisted by grace, are raised to the supernatural knowledge of the highest truths.

Moreover, to this capacity of intelligence God has united, in the affective part of the soul, a faculty of tasting those sublime objects which are revealed to the intelligence, and this faculty is called wisdom, or, rather, *sapience*, from the Latin word *sapere*, which signifies to taste, or to savour.* Thus it is that the Spirit of God, who is charity, brings to the soul which He inhabits, and in the measure in which He fills it, a super-rational knowledge. All the saints, we are told, have been implicit theologians. When the science has not been acquired, it has been infused by grace; and even among those saints who have made theology their study, doubtless their deepest acquaintance with its truths was derived from the same divine source. It is well to bear this in mind in these days of disproportionate admiration of the mere powers of ratiocination. Speaking of Jean-Marie when seven years old, his biographer says:—"The heart in him had absorbed the other faculties, and we do not find that he was remarkable at that age for either mental graces or intellectual gifts; his heart seemed to have profited at the expense of everything in which he was deficient. No reflections, but feelings; no sharp or lively sallies, but noble and generous impulses; no reasoning, but action; nothing calculated; all spontaneous, simple, and great, like inspiration."

His greatest delight was the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, at which, "like another Samuel, he would assist with angelic piety and recollection." The neighbours, when they observed the child's devotion, would say to the happy mother, "You must make your little son a priest." But gloomy times were at hand for France, in which altar and priest seemed about to be swept from the land. A day came when the little church at Dardilly did not open for the Holy Sacrifice; the bell was silent; and when the poor child, looking up in his mother's face, asked why she did not send him to Mass, she wiped away a tear, and, laying her hand on her heart, signified that henceforward this was the only temple where they could serve their God. Jean-Marie was then barely eight years old, but within the bosom of this gracious child was a sanctuary already prepared, where that service was never to cease. "As he beheld around him the fall of everything which he had learnt to love and respect, he raised it all up again in his heart." But although Mass was now no longer publicly offered, and impiety and infidelity triumphed through the length and breadth of the land, so that to the outward eye France wore

* "Dialogues Spirituels," liv. vi. chap. i.

the aspect of a God-denying nation, a faithful people kept up their religious exercises in the privacy of their homes, and, by stealth, occasionally in some despoiled sanctuary. There were priests also scattered through the country, hunted like so many noisome beasts, concealing themselves under every manner of disguise, and in every conceivable hiding-place; in hovels, barns, caves, or the depths of the thickest woods, where they would offer the Holy Sacrifice at the peril of their lives. On such occasions, pious families, like the Vianneys, who were united in a holy league for the protection of their proscribed pastors, would go any distance, even in the severest weather, for the rare blessing of being present at Mass and receiving the sacraments; and of this happiness none was more covetous than Jean-Marie.

For him the toils of life had already begun when the horrors of the Reign of Terror burst upon France. At seven years old it was his office to lead his father's little flock to the neighbouring pastures which Matthieu Vianney owned. In after life the Curé d'Ars often reverted, with a kind of fond regret, to the days when he had the charge, as he said, of only "three sheep and an ass"—a regret such as David may have felt when, amidst his royal cares, he thought of the days in which, with the ruddy glow of youth yet upon his cheek, he tended "those few sheep in the wilderness." "To many of the predestinate," says our biographer, "pastoral life has served as an apprenticeship to the interior life, and has been the vestibule of sanctity. Solitude is bad for him who does not live with God; and the shepherd's business in the freedom of the fields, in itself so innocent, does not always protect the morals of children, while it condemns them to a profound and dangerous ignorance of spiritual things. For our Jean-Marie it was at once a rest and a favour"—rest before his great day of toil began—"a source of light and blessing." God spoke to his heart through the beauties of nature, in which so many find only a refined sensual enjoyment, inviting him to His embrace, and to the ineffable joys of contemplation. He loved especially a little valley, fresh and green, "a very well of verdure," where fountains, fed from some secret source, oozed forth from their mossy bed to form a charming rivulet, over which the willow and the ash stooped their graceful boughs. It was called Chante-merle, from the song of the blackbirds that came to sing in the branches and sip at the stream. Here the little shepherds, young Vianney's companions, whose hearts his goodness and sweetness had won, and who beheld him with a kind of loving respect, would welcome him with shouts as he arrived with his inseparable companion, the

image of Blessed Mary; and here he made his first preludes in the work of gaining souls; for the priesthood was an instinct with him before it became an abiding desire and a vocation. Here he would place his Madonna on an altar of green turf, and, offering her his homage, invite the rest to do the same; and then, overflowing with love, he would preach to the little troop of devotion to Mary. Often they listened with breathless attention; but sometimes, with the levity of their age, they would leave the preacher and run off to play. Then would Jean-Marie return, with a zest far greater than theirs, to his own sweet recreation of converse with God.

Next to his love of God was his love of the poor. Matthieu Vianney kept up the traditional hospitality of his family, and it was Jean-Marie's delight to go in quest of the houseless vagrants, and collect them round the huge kitchen fire in his father's house. Thither would he bring the little ones, each in turn, to warm their numbed feet and hands; or he would cater for a few delicacies, and add the reserved portions of his own last meal to the contents of the great pot of potatoes, of which guests and entertainers partook together. Those who were of his own age he would teach the Pater, Ave, and the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, instructing them in the chief truths of religion, and exhorting them to love God. Such was the childhood of the Curé of Ars; and in it we may discern the germ of his Apostolic life.

When, on the accession of Napoleon to the dignity of First Consul, the churches were re-opened throughout France, Ecully, a town contiguous to Dardilly, received as its pastor one of the saintly confessors for the faith, the Abbé Balley, who has earned an additional title to our veneration in having discovered the vocation of the future Curé of Ars, and favoured it with all his power. The spectacle of this good priest's fervour at the altar profoundly touched young Vianney's heart. He sought him out and spoke with him, and instantly there was kindled within him "an immense desire to devote himself also, body and soul, to the service of the afflicted Church—a love and spirit of self-devotion so strong as to overbear and silence the scruples of humility." It was, however, no new thought with him: he had often said to himself, "If I were ever a priest, I would win many souls to God;" but the difficulties of the times had seemed to place an insuperable bar to the fulfilment of his wishes, and his own neglected education appeared likely now to interpose a serious obstacle. M. Balley had no sooner fixed on him his gentle, penetrating eye, skilled in reading consciences, than he conceived a special affection for him; but it required all the

discrimination of a spiritually-enlightened mind to conceive the confident hopes in which this good man never wavered; for Jean-Marie at this time—and he was now eighteen—was profoundly ignorant of all human learning. “He knew nothing! but then the Apostles, they also knew nothing.” God, who, when laying the foundations of His Church on earth, chose “the foolish things of the world” to “confound the wise,” and “the weak and contemptible things” to “confound the strong” and the proud, designed, in these latter days, to lay many fair stones in the spiritual building through a like feeble and despised instrument. M. Balley had the prescience of this design. He saw that this ignorant youth possessed already what the “Imitation of Christ” calls a “profound wisdom and a great perfection: the knowledge and the contempt of self;” and he never doubted that God would supply whatever else was needed to the accomplishment of His purpose. True, there was enough to discourage any ordinary man; for to slowness of apprehension Jean-Marie united an irretentive memory, and when we call to mind that he had to begin his classical studies at an age when most youths complete theirs, and that without any previously-formed habits of application, or acquired stock of cognate knowledge, it will not surprise us to find that his progress was very slow. But all was part of the great work of preparation: while learning seemed at a standstill, humility and self-abnegation were hollowing out deeper foundations. Young Vianney’s distrust of his own powers was not, as it is with so many, the reluctant confession of mortified vanity, which, looking to self for all, gives up all when self proves incapable. His self-distrust was of the genuine sort, having for its correlative, confidence in God. If we can do nothing, God can do everything; and so we find him betaking himself in pilgrimage to the tomb of S. Francis Regis, to obtain the grace to fit himself, by sufficient learning, to be a worthy labourer in his Lord’s vineyard. His faith was rewarded, and his progress henceforward, if not rapid, was, by contrast, surprising.

M. Monnin considers, however, that there has been some degree of exaggeration with regard to M. Vianney’s mental inferiority. “Nature certainly had done little for him, and grace had to reconstruct the work of nature by imparting to him those intellectual virtues, and those infused qualities, which no one who beheld him in the midst of the arduous labours of his Apostolate can have failed to recognize in him; but we think a little too much has been said of the Curé d’Ars’s ignorance and incapacity. What specially contributed to this prejudice was his own way of speaking of himself on all occa-

sions. One day when we wanted to ascertain the number of years he had passed at Ecully studying with M. Balley, he protested against this word *study*. 'I never studied,' he said; 'M. Balley, it is true, laboured for five or six years to teach me something; but it was trouble thrown away (il y a perdu son Latin). He never could cram anything into my stupid head.' " Against this self-depreciating judgment it is fair to set the subsequent testimonies of his companions at the seminary, who bear witness to the correctness and accuracy of his replies in the course of theological examinations, which in his case had to be conducted in French, for in Latin he was always deficient, though he appears to have learnt enough to understand the standard writers on philosophy and theology. On the whole we gather from the reminiscences of his fellow-students, that, while his abilities certainly did not rise above mediocrity, they were by no means stamped with any exceptional inferiority. "To pretend," observes one, "that M. Vianney was never anything but an ignoramus, is a great mistake; I am convinced that he was one of those who, if gifted with no external brilliancy, possess a sound, strong, upright judgment, which gives them a vast superiority over those superficial minds which shine in fluency of speech and readiness of memory, but really want for solidity."

Young Vianney's studies were broken in upon by an episode to which we owe a few words, as connected with the subject which it is our aim to keep principally in view. Elect souls are purified in the furnace of adversity, and Jean Marie's trials all converged to the same end—the perfecting in him of the grace of humility. If we were to select the two most special objects of the world's admiration in the human character, we should not, we apprehend, be far wrong in naming a commanding genius, and a chivalrous sense of honour. Military honour, in particular, is the Frenchman's idol. Young Vianney's path would have seemed to remove him very far from either the power of winning, or the opportunity of forfeiting, any adventitious credit which might accrue from such a source. Yet, in the inscrutable designs of Divine Providence, he was led to enact the part of a deserter! We say to enact the part, for no one who considers the circumstances could ever brand him with the name.

The facts were briefly these:—By some unaccountable oversight, his name was never inscribed upon the list of students for the priesthood, although M. Balley had given orders for the entry to be made; and he was drawn for the conscription. His family endeavoured to procure a substitute by the offer of a large sum of money, but in vain. It was the time of Napo-

leon's unjust war with Spain, and of his iniquitous seizure of Pius VII. The consciences of good men were alarmed; France was beginning to weary of giving her best blood to satisfy the ambition of one man; the new levies met with opposition amongst the peasantry, force was often needed to make the recruits march, and the roads were thronged with deserters. Jean-Marie bore the terrible blow with his accustomed patience and resignation; but he was attacked by a severe illness which detained him for some time in the hospital at Lyons, and a relapse caused a further detention in the hospital at Roanne. As soon as he was fit to move, he was ordered to join a detachment under orders to march for Spain. The young man neither murmured nor resisted; but on the day fixed for the departure of his column he went to pour out his sorrows before God in the church. He forgot how time passed, and when he appeared at the office, the recruiting-officer threatened to send him in chains to Bayonne. Some kinder persons took the poor boy's part, and represented that he would not have presented himself had he thought of deserting. Neither had he any plan of the kind; he placed himself as an infant in the hands of God, and began his sad journey, taking his rosary to drive away the dismal thoughts which beset him. A stranger accosted him, asked him the cause of his sadness, relieved him of his heavy knapsack, and, bidding him follow and fear nothing, led him through woods and lonely paths to a secluded house, at the door of which he knocked, exchanged a few words with the inmates, and left young Vianney in their charge. Whether his guide were an angel, or one sent by God to perform an angelic office, we cannot tell. Nothing more was ever heard or seen of him. The good people to whom Jean-Marie had been entrusted, a shoemaker and his wife, took him to the village of Noës, on the borders of the forest of the Madeleine; and, strange to say, the first person taken into their confidence was the mayor of the commune, who provided him a safe asylum.

The Abbé Monnin evidently does not consider that the young man's conduct needed apology; nevertheless he evinces a fear that it may be otherwise regarded; and perhaps there is no country in which sensitiveness on this point was more to be apprehended than France. Not that we English have a less regard for the soldier's duty to his country, or his fidelity to his engagements, yet our very disposition to regard this fidelity as a duty, rather than a point of honour—or, rather, pre-eminently as a duty—makes us a little more willing to listen to reason. Duties may be balanced and measured, but honour does not submit to any comparative estimate of its

claims: they are insatiable. With the sense of honour, when kept in its due subordinate position, we have no quarrel. It is natural to man to regard certain faults or acts as peculiarly disgraceful in the eyes of his fellow men, and their opposite virtues as noble,—this feeling being usually stronger in proportion to the refinement and moral elevation of the individual character; and although divine love tends to supersede it, as it does all that is merely natural, it does not eradicate it. The sense of honour acts also in this world of ours as a check upon much evil, exercising a powerful influence on many persons who have no fear of God, and little moral principle. Honour often guards honesty, as bashfulness protects purity; and we can never undervalue anything which is the means of hindering the commission of a single mortal sin. But the world's standard of morality, though it has been modified by the Gospel, is not Christian, and its detestable paganism too frequently reacts on the code of honour. Add to which, that as the sense of honour regards man's opinion rather than God's law, it may easily become excessive, even when not perverted; and we cannot, therefore, too strongly protest against the concessions to its claims which even good men seem often afraid not to make, or, at least, to appear to make. They do not *dare to seem* to undervalue them. For this reason we regret, not M. Monnin's explanations, but his apologetic tone. We believe the law of conscription to be essentially unjust, except when the country is in danger and needs the arms of her children for her defence. Under such circumstances, law does but render a duty compulsory; but when used as an engine to gratify ambition or the love of glory, at the caprice of selfish rulers, we esteem it as nothing less than a tyrannical interference with man's natural right to choose his own vocation in life. Besides, in young Vianney's case, as we have seen, he had a legal exemption as studying for the priesthood, and it was only by some unaccountable negligence that his name had not been entered on the list. The Curé d'Ars had certainly a sufficiently tender conscience, and it would not seem that he ever spoke of his "desertion" as a sin, though he reproached himself, as appears from a touching letter of his, with the pain and anxiety which he caused his parents. He willingly related all the adventures attending his concealment, and once, speaking of his Cross of the Legion of Honour, which the Emperor had sent him, he observed, accompanying the remark with a significant expression of face, "I don't know why the Emperor gave it me, unless it was because I was a deserter."

The period of Jean-Marie's concealment in the little village

of Noës abounds, as do other portions of the narrative, with touching examples of the faith, kindliness, and *affectionateness* of the French peasantry. The good people of Noës knew the treasure they possessed; they knew it at once, with the quick perception of the poor for real goodness; and when, after fourteen months, he was able to return to his family, the regrets of the whole village followed him, mitigated only by the hopes of his return one day as their pastor. We have now the recommencement of his studies, then his entry at the little seminary of Verrières for his course of philosophy, where he ended, as at Noës he began, by being esteemed a saint; then the, to him, more congenial study of theology with his old preceptor, who at length believed him sufficiently prepared to pass his examination at the great seminary of Lyons. But now was to follow "that crowning trial by which it pleased God to perfect in the soul of this young man the interior work of entire self-spoliation, which was to make him an instrument of such admirable pliancy in His hands." In the imposing presence of his judges, Jean-Marie lost his self-possession, and could only stammer out a few incoherent replies. Had not M. Balley prevailed on the superior to come, with one of the grand vicars, to his presbytery, to examine the candidate in private, France and the whole Church would have suffered an inestimable loss. Admitted to the seminary, his life was that of an angel rather than of a man. But who can tell the number of those interior acts of humility, of which his own exceeding self-distrust was the source? "How often, during the long hours he spent before the Blessed Sacrament, his sole consolation was to unite himself to the ignominies of his Master." How often, adopting the words of the penitent Psalmist, would he thank God that he had been made "a scoff and derision to those who were round about him." In proportion to the depth of his humility was the confidence with which he cast himself upon God, and sought light and strength in Him alone. Never was there a more signal fulfilment of the promise, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted:" a few short years, and this ignorant, incompetent man was to occupy "the highest place in the veneration of his contemporaries, and to compel the respect even of the most sceptical. The Providence of God thus laughs to scorn the thoughts of men; and facts little bear out the shrewdest prognostications when Heaven has one design, and earth another. The Spirit of God loves to conceal itself under what is lowliest and meanest, as if to show that human wisdom has no part in His works. He even loves, for a time, to exhibit the weakness of the instruments He employs, in order to prove that

the effects that follow proceed from another cause, Himself alone." Up to the last we see this Divine procedure exemplified; for great as was the esteem in which young Vianney was held at the seminary for his virtues and piety, his ordination would have been postponed but for the timely intervention once more of M. Balley, and the instinctive penetration of the Abbé Courbon, with whom the decision rested. "Is young Vianney pious? Does he say his rosary well? Is he devout to the Blessed Virgin?" Such were the questions put by the grand vicar. "He is a model of piety," was the reply. "Well, I receive him; Divine grace will do the rest." The anticipation was a prophecy; but who could have foreseen how amply it would be fulfilled, or dreamed of all that lay infolded in those two words, "the rest?"

M. Balley begged to have his beloved pupil for his assistant, and Ecully now possessed two saints instead of one. To the singular holiness of M. Balley, the Curé of Ars has borne unequivocal testimony. It was his constant theme in after life. "I might have been good for something in time," he would say, "if I had always had the blessing of living with M. Balley. It was enough to make one love God only to hear him say 'My God, I love Thee with my whole heart.' He repeated it continually all day long, when he was alone, and ceased not to do the same in his chamber at night until he fell asleep." Then he would tell his people of "the disciplines, hair-shirts, chains, and bracelets of iron, with which this holy man crucified his flesh;" but he took care not to add what has, nevertheless, been well proved, that the disciple was not behind his master in any penitential exercise. "Here, my poor Vianney," said the dying man in their last touching interview, "hide all these things"—he spoke of his instruments of penance—"people would think that I had done something for the expiation of my sins, and would leave me in purgatory to the end of the world." Then, raising his hand to bless the young priest, who knelt bathed in tears at his feet, "Farewell, dear child," he added; "courage: go on loving and serving the Good Master—remember me at the altar. Farewell! We shall meet above!" Courage, indeed, was needed! Forty years were before him of a life inconceivable, intolerable to flesh and blood—forty years of "full days" (we might almost add "nights") without respite, without pause, without breathing-time; forty years of a daily death to all that nature loves; forty years, during which he was to be consumed as a perpetual victim of the love of God and zeal for souls. "Oh! if I had known what it is to have the cure of souls," he often exclaimed, "I would much rather have run off to La Trappe."

His humility made him decline so large a field as the town of Ecully, the inhabitants of which were most desirous to retain him in M. Balley's place; and he was appointed Curé of Ars. "Go, my friend," said the Abbé Courbon; "there is not much love of God in that parish; you will enkindle it." We need not inform our readers how wonderfully this presage was accomplished; how Ars, from an obscure little village, to which the traveller's foot rarely stepped aside, became a centre to which a tide of countless pilgrims was continually pouring, and this for years, in a steadily progressive increase. Truly, Ars has been the standing miracle of our day, a prodigy only surpassed by that other prodigy which always accompanies the wonders which God works in His Church, the comparatively little notice it has excited outside her fold. These things are not done in a corner; but the world contrives to ignore them, and talks as confidently as ever of the age of miracles being passed. Common curiosity, one might have supposed, would have led men to inquire into the matter. If arrow-heads are found in the drift, which seem to point to a higher antiquity of man than the Bible records, the whole world is in a fever of excitement; nay, we may be bold to say, that the discovery of the skeleton of an old Druid, or the bones of some antediluvian saurian, would have drawn more attention to the little village in the Dombes, from the Protestant world of England, than all the wonders of which it was the manifest theatre for thirty years, during which the "Pilgrimage of Ars," as M. Monnin observes, "seemed to bring back a scene from the times of S. Bernard into the broad daylight of the nineteenth century." The rumours afloat of the marvels attending the foundation of the *Providence*, an asylum for orphan and destitute girls, and which afterwards became the model of so many similar institutions in France; the desire of numerous holy souls to avail themselves of the spiritual direction of the saintly Curé; the crowds of poor that thronged to him for relief—such, amongst others, were the instrumental causes of the first concourse of strangers to Ars. But Catherine Lassagne, a pious woman, more in the Curé's confidence, perhaps, than any other person, and to whom we owe so many of the interesting details which have been preserved, attributed it chiefly to "the prayers of M. le Curé for the conversion of sinners. The grace which he obtained for them," she said, "was so powerful, that it went to seek them out, and would leave them no rest till it had brought them to his feet."

This grace was equally wonderful in the original conversion of the little pleasure-loving and God-forgetting village.

Viewed by the cold eye of reason, how inadequate were the means available for the production of so rapid and thorough a change; for these means must be gauged by the apparent qualifications of him who brought it about. His personal influence was his only visible weapon. He is described at that time as "destitute of all natural means of attracting interest or commanding admiration. He had none of the usual graces of youth, nor had he yet attained that spiritual beauty which glorified his old age. His face was pale and angular, his stature low, his gait awkward, his manner shy and timid; his whole air ordinary and unattractive. There was nothing in his appearance, except its asceticism and the singular brightness of his eyes, to impress the mind of a common observer." We have already seen that his intellectual abilities partook of the same mediocrity, while his extraordinary humility, which made him studious to conceal his virtues and avoid notice, might well have been discouraged at the sight of the unpromising field which he had been sent to cultivate; and without hope, what can be effected? But the Curé of Ars was a stranger to discouragement, because he never hoped for anything from himself, but hoped all from God; and God knows nothing of difficulties. Difficulties he knew full well there were, but not too great to be overcome by the might of prayers, and tears, and sighs, and groans, so all-powerful with the Lord. He resolved, therefore, to spend day and night in imploring the Divine mercy to act immediately upon the hearts of his flock. Many years later, we find him making this reply to the founder of a famous orphan-asylum, who consulted him as to the best way of drawing public attention to the work, and obtaining public support for it through the medium of the press: "Instead of making a noise in the papers, clamour at the door of the Tabernacle." It had been his own method. From the very first he threw himself entirely on supernatural means. One of higher natural attainments, with much zeal perchance, but far less self-knowledge and self-renunciation, would possibly have taken a very different course. He would have worked hard, he would have preached rousing sermons, he would have rebuked, upbraided, scolded his congregation; he would have been diligent in the performance of his pastoral duties; and yet—who knows?—this hard-working priest, after years of labour, might have had cause to complain, as many a devoted servant of his Lord has complained, of the little visible fruit that had rewarded his toils. "Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing." Yes, nothing: the fishes come at the Lord's bidding, not by man's industry; and so to the

Lord his servant turns first, before he lets down his net. Who ever worked harder than the Curé d'Ars? but what had preceded and what had accompanied that work?

No sooner was the new Curé installed in his parish, than he chose the church as his dwelling-place. He would be seen for hours together kneeling, perfectly motionless, in the midst of the sanctuary, "bathing (to use his own expression) in the flames of love which issued from the Divine Presence on the altar." He entered the church at daybreak, and remained till the evening Angelus. There he was sure to be found if he was wanted. "Whilst reciting his office," says Catherine Lassagne, "he would gaze at the Tabernacle with a smile which gladdened the heart. I have been struck by it many times: it seemed as if he *saw* our Lord."

So impressed, indeed, was one of his assistant priests in later years with the expression he observed upon his face, when coming once suddenly upon him, that he instinctively turned towards the Tabernacle, as expecting himself to see something extraordinary; and he remarked afterwards to his brethren, "I believe, by and bye, the Curé d'Ars will subsist on nothing but the Holy Eucharist." Indeed, the opinion that the Curé saw our Lord with his bodily eyes at the altar was very general.

A great portion of the night was also spent by him in the church. He had little need, as we may suppose, of the comforts of a snug presbytery; and, indeed, from the beginning it had never been what people would call decently comfortable, containing nothing but the scant furniture of the ascetic Balley; but "it soon began to wear that forlorn and dismantled appearance which afterwards so forcibly struck whoever had the privilege of being admitted within its walls. It seemed as if it were the abode of a spirit, so utterly destitute was it of all things needful for the body."

Nothing was lost upon the observant parishioners: they were Catholics, though cold ones, and they were poor Catholics, so had unperverted instincts. From the first they noticed the fervour of their new priest at the altar, and said, "We have got a saint." The poor man may neglect his religion, but he has the true conception, as M. Monnin observes, of what a priest ought to be. The priest with him is, before all things, the man of God, the man of intercession and sacrifice; and if he sees that his pastor loves best to be in the church, and to "weep between the porch and the altar," he says to his comrades, admiringly, "See, my pastor is performing his great duty for me." He regards him as a true priest and prophet of God, and a true "lover of his brethren, who prayeth

much for the people"* committed to his charge. And such was M. Vianney's own conception of the sacerdotal office. Prayer and sacrifice are pre-eminently the functions of the priest.

He has been chosen from amongst the living to offer to God those sacrifices, the sweet odour of which draws down His mercy on the world. His heart, a pure vessel of mortification and prayer, must, like the thurible which he waves at the feet of his Lord, be ever open towards heaven and closed towards earth: exhaling continually that voluntary incense which burns to purify the air, and consumes itself in neutralizing the invisible and fatal miasma with which it is surrounded.

M. Vianney felt that his first and only title to the esteem of the faithful was his priestly character; his sole claim on their affections, the overflowing love of his priest's heart—a love which had its source and pattern in the Sacred Heart of the Great High Priest. This was enough: he never essayed the power of any other influence. "The world, it has been well said, belongs to him who loves it best, and does most to prove his love; and it was by the might of love that M. Vianney mastered the hearts of his people."

To prayer and the daily offering of the Holy Sacrifice, he joined the zealous preaching of God's word. To this second great priestly duty he attached very high importance; and the marvellous facility in preaching which he afterwards possessed had not been acquired without long hours of labour and much practice. But in subsequent years, when he almost lived in the confessional, he had no time for preparation; neither did he need it. His soul was unceasingly applied to God, and so he passed at once from the confessional to the pulpit, carrying with him an imperturbable composure, the result, not of any confidence in his own powers, but of an absolute forgetfulness of self. Such portions of his catechetical instructions and homilies as the memory of his hearers has preserved to us, are sufficient to prove that his preparation had never been a work of human industry seeking to effect an impression by natural eloquence, but that his efforts were of that character which God requires, and which He blesses by the supply of all that they lack power to accomplish. Nothing is more striking in these precious fragments than their touching simplicity, and the homely familiarity which accompanies their intense earnestness; the earnestness of one who has seen, as it were, and handled that of which he speaks; who has a fresh fountain within from which he draws, and needs not to go and borrow standing water from the cisterns of others.

* 2 Mach. xv. 14.

His eloquence is described as something indefinable. It laid hold immediately upon mind and heart. It seemed a kind of living word; so simple that the most ignorant could understand and feel it, and, at one and the same time, "ministering food to the contemplation of the most exalted intelligence." It had the true Gospel stamp upon it. Hence it was very difficult to fix in writing what he uttered. But people went away with their hearts full, with their souls stirred, and longing to return on the morrow to taste again of this heavenly manna. Preaching one day at S. Sulpice—this was when the Curé's fame had spread far and wide—M. Pétitot broke off in a panegyric he was delivering on S. Charles Borromeo, to exclaim, "I have seen a saint once in my life; I heard him exhort the crowd. All his eloquence consisted in saying, 'My children, love the Good God. He is so good. Love Him dearly.' Well, this saint with these simple words converted more souls than we do with our long sermons."

To the last he never discontinued the use of a certain occasional rusticity of speech, the legacy of his early life, and of which, had he ever aimed at graces and refinements of style, he might assuredly, in a great measure, have rid himself. M. Vianney thoroughly appreciated and blessed God for the gift of eloquence in others, but he seemed to disdain it for himself. Indeed, we might almost believe that it was from a motive of humility he set grammar and syntax at nought. His discourse, however, with all its homeliness and incorrectness of expression, had power to penetrate consciences, and to enlighten and convert souls. Born and reared among the poor, he doubtless felt that there was a heartiness in their language which best found its way to their affections. To him also it was *natural*: that was enough; and to us its very genuineness and simplicity would have at once redeemed it from the charge of vulgarity, could the idea of vulgarity have been associated with one so transformed and spiritualized. Transformed, indeed, he became to such a degree, that, in the last years of his life the frail tenement seemed scarcely to veil the glorious spirit within; but *changed* he was not, and nothing is more worthy of notice than the little effect education had had in remodelling the poor peasant of Dardilly. May we not in this catch an additional glimpse of the peculiar lesson which God designed to teach in him to an artificial and over-critical age; an age idolatrous of refinement, and wedded to conventionalities which threaten to stifle the very work of the Spirit of God in the soul?

To win his flock over to God, M. Vianney's first aim was to establish amongst them "a living focus of piety;" to

form a little court for our Lord in the Tabernacle, that He might never be left without worshippers. Difficult as such an undertaking might seem in an exclusively agricultural parish, and few in number as were the faithful souls to co-operate in his design, it was gently and sweetly accomplished. The nucleus of piety was composed in the first instance of four individuals. The first was Mdlle. Ars, the excellent lady of the old *château*, a very Anna for her devotion to God in His temple; the second was a simple, unlettered peasant, a good father of a family, whose fervent piety was the joy of his pastor's heart. Never did that good man pass the church-door without entering to adore his Lord. He would leave his spade, hoe, and pickaxe outside, and remain for hours together sitting or kneeling before the Tabernacle. M. Vianney, observing that he never moved his lips, said to him one day, "My good father, what do you say to our Lord in those long visits you pay Him every day, and many times a day?" "I say nothing to Him," was the reply; "I look at Him, and He looks at me."* We have here, as M. Monnin observes, the whole secret of sanctity. It may lead many of us to doubt whether, with our multiplied vocal prayers, and, we may add, our multiplied prayer-books, we are taking the shortest or surest road to perfection. Books are valuable as helps to devotion, but poor substitutes for it; and they become positive hindrances to the work of grace if, by looking at them, we are diverted from fixing our inward eye upon Him, the gazing at Whom is to transform us into His image. A poor widow, *la mère Bibot*, who lived near the church, and kept house (if so it may be called) for the Curé, made the third of this little group of worshippers; which was completed by the arrival of Mdlle. Pignaut, a person already highly esteemed at Lyons for her piety, and who now left that city to enjoy the benefit of M. Vianney's pastoral care.

Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament was the means employed by M. Olier for the reform of the parish of S. Sulpice. We all know what was its marvellous success; and such, we may confidently add, its success would ever be. When M. Vianney arrived, frequent communion was unknown and unthought of at Ars. "I have nothing to do here," said the holy pastor; "I fear I shall be damned. If I could see our Blessed Lord known and loved; if I could daily distribute His most Holy Body to a large number of the faithful, how happy should I

* The French is more expressive, as including the idea of attention:—
 "Je l'avise, et Il m'avise."

be!" It was not long before he had this consolation; and it was by means of the same little devout band who had rendered the perpetual adoration possible, that he accomplished this object. Mdlle. Ars had always been a frequent communicant; she now became more assiduous. Mdlle. Pignaut communicated almost daily. Seized with a pious emulation, and moved by the instructions she received in the confessional and from the pulpit—for the great Sacrament of Love was the Curé's most constant theme—the widow Bibot followed her example. Many other pious souls adopted the same practice. The holy table was soon thronged. The saintly pastor threw himself warmly into the spirit of the Church with regard to frequent communion. He was of the school of S. Alphonsus Liguori, of S. Francis de Sales, of S. Vincent de Paul—may we not add, of all the saints?—in believing that the Adorable Eucharist is that "daily bread" which we pray for in the Paternoster; and that, for the true faithful it is always Easter time. He did not attach severe conditions to the frequent reception of this Divine Food. "Did he meet with a soul weak, but conscious of its weakness—imperfect, but groaning over its imperfections, and labouring to correct them—immediately he strove to form the interior life in it, and recommended frequent recourse to this Divine aliment to strengthen that life."

The third great means of sanctification which he adopted was the establishment of confraternities, and, in particular, those of the Rosary and of the Blessed Sacrament. By the first he desired to gain the mothers and girls; by the second to attract the men and boys; and, by leading them to the church and grouping them round the altar, bring them under the influence of a holy discipline. We are not writing the biography of the Curé of Ars; we are but indicating the *method* which he employed for the conversion of his flock, with the view chiefly of drawing attention to two momentous facts: first, that no more ungrateful field for any striking result could well be conceived than this little sequestered village, whose population divided all their energies between agricultural labour and the amusement of dancing; secondly, that the means applied to the fructification of this barren field belonged altogether to the supernatural order. The engine which the Curé brought to bear upon it, and which he worked with all his energy, was of Divine fabrication, every wheel and spring forming part of the Church's heavenly system. There was nothing in it of prudent human device, or mere laborious human diligence. What, indeed, may it be supposed, would have been the effect produced upon the mass of indifference he was sent to animate, by the mere natural abilities of this

man? What, again, by any mere natural efforts, however vigorous, and however conscientiously directed? It was because grace not only prompted his actions, but, so to say, saturated them—because he performed them, not only *for* God, but *in* God—that their result was so wonderful, so irresistible. It was the sanctity of the Curé which converted Ars.

“At this distance of time,” says M. Monnin, “when, in consequence of the number of strangers who have been induced by the pilgrimage to settle at Ars, a second formation has covered this primitive vegetation, it has become difficult to trace the deep labours of our great husbandman; but five-and-twenty or thirty years ago Ars was a veritable Christian oasis. ‘I have often walked in the fields in harvest time,’ said a frequent visitor at the place, ‘without hearing a single oath or a single unseemly expression.’ I once remarked this to a peasant, who replied, with great simplicity, ‘We are no better than other people; but we should be ashamed to do such things *so near a Saint.*’”

What must have been the influence of this continued propinquity we may imagine from the effect produced even by a passing sight of him, and by a word from those lips upon which, after the pattern of his Lord, “grace had been poured.” It was at one of those missions in the neighbourhood, at which, in the early years of his ministry, M. Vianney was often called to assist, that the following incident occurred:—

“I must go back forty years,” writes a good priest after the Curé’s death, “to retrace my first recollections of this venerable man. It was in the year 1820, when I was about ten years old. We were practising, in the court of the college where I was studying, to strew the flowers for the procession of Corpus Christi, when I saw a priest come in, of a very simple, poor, and humble exterior. One of my companions whispered to me, ‘That is the Curé of Ars; *he is a Saint*; he lives upon nothing but boiled potatoes.’ I looked at him with amazement. As some of us addressed him in a few courteous words, he stopped for a moment and said, with a kind smile, ‘My friends, when you are strewing flowers before the Blessed Sacrament, hide your hearts in your baskets, and send them amid your roses to Jesus Christ.’ Then, without paying any other visit, he went straight across the court to the chapel, to pay his homage to the Master of the house in His tabernacle. I have forgotten nearly all the names of my fellow-students, and almost all the other circumstances of that time; but the words of that priest, his visit to the Blessed Sacrament, and the speech of my companion, have never been effaced from my memory. I was especially struck (for I was a greedy boy) with the idea of a man who *lived on potatoes*. I felt, without exactly knowing why, that this implied something great and wonderful, and it was probably this which kept the other circumstances in my mind.” “Surely,” adds the writer of the English life, “as he passed across that college courtyard, *God* (in the

saintly priest's own words, as afterwards applied to his bishop) *passed with him*, and impressed that ideal of mingled austerity and sweetness, the very type of sacerdotal sanctity, upon those children's hearts."

We may reckon amongst the supernatural means of conversion, the daily spectacle of the beautiful, and even gorgeous, little church, once so bare and desolate, "as cold and empty as the hearts of the worshippers." This austere lover of poverty had been even lavish and prodigal in all that concerned the glory of God's house, the type of Heaven, and an actual Heaven upon earth, since God Incarnate has His throne therein. From the zeal of their pastor, "the people learned to feel the dignity of God's worship, to love their church, and, above all, to frequent it." It might have puzzled anyone who beheld its magnificence—for the Curé had a very passion for all that is beautiful and costly in what he called the "*ménage du bon Dieu*"—the housekeeping of the good God—to conceive upon what rich funds he was privileged to draw. He expended all he had to spend; the rest seemed to come of itself. Christian liberality is infectious, and the Curé, besides, seemed to have made interest with the court of Heaven to obtain whatever he wanted. His receipt, like *Sœur Rosalie's*, to fill one hand, was to have the other always empty; and the heart and the hands of the Curé were indeed, like the ocean, inexhaustible. Speaking of him in later years, his biographer tells us that he had but to will to obtain at once whatever sum of money he required; it poured in to him from distant, often unknown sources. "Sometimes, but rarely, there would be a check in the flow; then M. Vianney began to 'bother his good saints—*cassait la tête à ses bons saints*'—and the mysterious stream recommenced running. He would find money in his pockets, on his table, in his drawers, even amongst the ashes on the hearth." There is something very striking in the simplicity with which he would rejoice in the reception of these heavenly windfalls. In Catherine's notes we find the following: "The Curé said, 'A curious thing happened to me to-day. I laughed at it all alone by myself. I perceived my purse was going on filling, filling.' 'Some one has given you this money, M. le Curé.' 'I don't think so,' he rejoined. 'My drawer is locked. Besides, it is not the first time. The poorer you make yourself for the love of God, the richer you really are.'" Hundreds of parallel and well-attested incidents are recorded. His delight was manifested with the same unaffected simplicity when any rich present was made to his church. When the Viscomte d'Ars gave him some splendid furniture for the high altar, "the joy of the holy Curé was like that of a child. He went about the

parish calling upon his people to rejoice with him. 'Come, good mother,' he said to one of his old women, 'come and see something beautiful before you die.' " Immediately he has the inspiration to offer all these treasures to the Blessed Virgin. They will be blessed a hundredfold by passing through her hands. "She must convert us," he said; and so he leads all his parish in procession to Fourvières, a celebrated shrine of our Lady near Lyons. "That day," says M. Monnin, "has remained a memorable epoch to the people of Ars. It marked the precise period of a great religious transformation. At the same time it shed a sudden light upon the soul of the holy priest. His heart swelled with a sense of joy unknown before, which seemed like the revelation of the future glory of his humble village."

The Abbé dates from the foundation of the "Providence"—that embodiment of the Curé's mind, of his faith, his simplicity, his love of poverty, his exalted aims, his tender charity—the beginning, strictly speaking, of his miraculous life, the point at which the extraordinary merges into the supernatural. We must resist the temptation to quote, or so much as allude to, details. Suffice it to say, that this *Orphanage*, which was often literally sustained upon miraculous food, and where little regard was paid to matters of external regulation, or mere mechanical arrangement—to which so much importance is attached in our day—was itself a miracle of success. But, if modern educational appliances were wanting, and modern theories of progress were but little in favour, yet, on the other hand, what assiduous pains were taken that the inmates might become pleasing in our Lord's eyes, by the practice of the choicest and most beautiful virtues! Here the world's abandoned little ones of all ages, gathered from the highways and hedges, often—young as they were—hardened in vice, learned not only to live Christian lives, but voluntarily to follow the counsels of evangelical perfection. Many died most saintly deaths, and, what is perhaps more remarkable, few who were sent forth from this asylum, again to mix with the world, but persevered in leading edifying lives.

It was at the Providence that those catechetical instructions were first commenced which for thirty years formed the delight of crowded audiences. He began by feeding poor children with the bread of the Word, before dealing it out to the pilgrims of France, Germany, Belgium, and England. And of the wonders of that pilgrimage what can we say? The shortest description we could give would be too large for our space, and all too unworthy of the subject. We will quote but one remark from the biography: "Divine Providence has

so ordered it that, during a course of thirty years, the men of this nineteenth century, so enamoured of all manner of vanities, should come in crowds to do homage to humility and simplicity. While the philosophers of our day have been inveighing against confession and its consequences, the people have replied by flocking to Ars to venerate a confessor." It was the fame of his goodness which first allured men to his feet. The Curé's apostolate, as that of our Lord's, of whom he was so living an image, commenced with the poor and the afflicted in body as well as mind. Every sorrow and every sickness resorted to him. In vain he endeavoured to eclipse himself and shelter his miraculous powers behind "his dear little Saint Philomena;" in vain he grew in self-distrust amidst the increasing confidence of thousands. Oh, if he could but escape and leave his place to one more worthy! Meanwhile houses were built, roads constructed, a whole system of public conveyances organized, for the accommodation of the crowds that flocked to this once obscure little village in the Dombes. Each succeeding year beheld a larger influx, until the number of pilgrims swelled to an average of 80,000. S. Philip Neri prayed that he might never have a single hour or a single moment to himself; our saint quickly arrived at this state of glorious captivity. If the Stylite caused himself to be fixed to the granite rock, that, even if he would, he might not be able to move beyond the length of his chain, and should be free only to contemplate Heaven and sigh after his Lord, the Curé of Ars had also his rock and his chain: he was riveted to his confessional by the souls of his penitents.

In reading of this astonishing manifestation, we seem transported back to what men are pleased to call legendary times:—

We are not living in a mythical age: no one can so much as imagine that the life of this man, our contemporary, already bears traces of legendary elaboration. It is present history, counting its witnesses by thousands and tens of thousands, in which we behold all that we admire in the stories of the past, all that we believe to belong to a heroism unattainable in modern times:—a perfect abnegation, terrific austerities, an unparalleled humility, an unbounded love of God and man; and, in recompense of this complete abandonment of a creature to his Creator, dominion over souls, the power to attract them from afar, to touch, convert, and save them; and, as a pledge of this empire in the spiritual order, a marvellous power over nature, the power of modifying the ordinary conditions of things, of healing corporal infirmities, of reading consciences as an open book, of foretelling the future—in a word, the gift of miracles.

When we think of all the marvels related of the Fathers of

the Desert, or read of those great wonder-workers of the Middle Ages who drew whole populations after them, we instinctively beheld them surrounded with an aureole of glory, even in the natural order—and many of them undoubtedly were possessed of no common endowments—yet, whether or no, we set them apart from the ordinary category of their fellow-men: we idealize them, in short; but in proportion as we invest them with this exceptional dignity, in that same proportion we unconsciously abstract from the pure glory of God in the kingdom of His grace. Here, however, there is no room for any such process of the imagination. Looked at from the natural side, who could lend himself less to such idealization than the poor peasant of Dardilly? Viewed from the supernatural, what Saint has manifested that beauty which is the splendour of sanctity with more sublimity, brilliancy, or winningness, than the Curé of Ars? “When we reflect,” observes M. Monnin, “that he had no other title to the admiration of his contemporaries than his eminent piety; that in him no aureole of any kind came to add its lustre to that of his virtue; that even his virtue, in order to impress the world, had to contend with and triumph over that simplicity which he called his *ignorance*, and which, before it had received the consecration of miracles, of the gift of prophecy, and of infused qualities, might well, indeed, have been deemed excessive; the fact of his unparalleled celebrity becomes the more striking. One begins to think that the moral sense of mankind is not so profoundly weakened as it would appear, and that the presence of a few saints in the midst of this decrepit society would, perhaps, suffice to renew that faith which saves the world.”

But the beauty of the God-Man, Himself the fount and type of all that is lovely, will be irresistible so long as man has heart or eye for beauty. The charm which drew the multitude around Jesus upon earth still captivates in those in whom He specially dwells. His image shines through the earthly husk.

The Curé d'Ars was favoured to a very high degree with the marvellous gift of appearing to the eyes of all the image of Jesus Christ—another Jesus Christ. Men recalled to mind, when they beheld him, what M. Olier said in praise of Father de Condren: “His exterior was but the husk and shell of what he really was. He was like the Host upon our altars; externally we see the accidents, the species of bread, but within is Jesus Christ.” So also was it with this great servant of our Lord. There was another self within: the interior of Jesus Christ, and His hidden life. This explains the astonishing power he had over hearts. Without intending it, without willing it, this man “whose bodily presence was so weak,” drew everything within the sphere of his attraction. If once you had met his look, or heard his

word, that word, that look, fascinated you. The eye was dazzled, as it were, and the ear deaf to all else. Men of the world, used to other seductions, have often confessed, that ever since they had beheld the Curé of Ars, his image never left them. It would have been difficult to picture to oneself a face which awakened more vividly the idea of the Saint.

M. Renan, in an article which appeared some years ago in the *Journal des Débats*, complains that modern saints are vulgar and commonplace. "They are altogether wanting," he declares, "in the grand bearing, distinguished air, and nobility of the saints of the old school. That," he says, "is a kind of poetry which is quite gone out. Mankind have lost the legend-making faculty: we shall never again see those saints of the old style, those majestic figures, those exalted representations of the ideal and Divine side of humanity." The saints, of course, never were such representations, seeing that the natural man has no *Divine side*. The general meaning of this brilliant, but far from profound, freethinker is, however, obvious; and the words recurred to the memory of the historian, M. Louis Lacroix, "at the very moment when (as he says) I was witnessing that sublime scene (the Curé catechizing), and admiring the ideal beauty of him who was the chief personage. For the expression of unsparing mortification and of ravishing charity in the countenance of the ascetic Curé of Ars at least equalled the beauty which we are willing to recognize in the saints of past times. The Church has certainly a higher mission than that of satisfying the artistic tastes of those who have the heart to be studying the æsthetic in presence of sanctity; but even in this wholly secondary point of view I can affirm that there is nothing wanting to content the most exacting taste; and if the critic in question had had the happy thought of coming here to study the physiognomy of the Curé of Ars, I am certain he must have declared himself satisfied, and would have owned that the Church can still give birth to the beautiful, even as she continues to produce the true and the good." This ideal beauty, we must never forget, owed nothing to form or to anything external whatsoever. The supernatural shone through the natural, but not by means of it. "The person of the saint becomes," as M. Monnin well expresses it, "a clear and beautiful crystal through which we perceive the majestic and Divine figure of Christ our Lord."

M. Renan, as we have seen, believes the effect produced by the saints to have been owing to some *Divine* element in humanity, though the term is probably, like many of the apparently spiritual expressions of modern sceptics, a mere figure

of speech. Now, whatever natural advantages they have in any case possessed, of which grace after sanctifying availed itself, it is as true with respect to the most gifted as to the Curé of Ars, that their power over hearts and consciences was derived, not from those natural advantages, but from God dwelling in them. There is no stage effect in the saints, any more than there is in the Church's ceremonial. Worldly men fall into a kindred error with reference to the beauty of Catholic worship. They esteem the whole an impressive pageant, the object and tendency of which is to work on the imagination, and, through the imagination, on the affections. The Church, they will have it, has thus cleverly contrived to enlist in her favour man's love of the beautiful in art and of dramatic effect. Such a notion could not maintain itself in presence of the Curé of Ars. Though it was not given to all to behold him with eyes enlightened by Divine faith, yet all in a measure acknowledged the same influence—that of a supernatural goodness beaming forth in its essential expression, the beautiful.

The heart is the last thing that dies in us; and the heart lives on the admiration of the beautiful and the good. When the beautiful and the good pass before us, no matter under what form, the heart is profoundly moved. It experiences something like the inward thrill of Elizabeth at the sight of Mary. We have heard a distinguished *savant*, who had little religious belief, exclaim in his enthusiasm, "I do not think that since the stable of Bethlehem anything like this has been seen." He was mistaken; he had not read the history of the Church; but what he said was true in this sense—that the life of the Curé of Ars, as that of all the saints, is the continuation of the life of our Lord. A celebrated poet, no longer master of his feelings, forgot himself so far as to exclaim, in the Curé's own presence, "Never did I behold God so near!" "True, my friend," replied M. Vianney, pointing to the altar, where the Blessed Sacrament was exposed: "God is not far from us; we have Him there in the sanctuary of His love."

We are speaking now of the last and glorified years of his life. The charm then worked instantaneously on all; but before the commencement of what M. Monnin calls his miraculous life, individuals catching a sight only of externals, and not giving themselves time to be impressed by what those externals veiled, would express themselves in a manner which, whilst offering an apparent exception to the general admiration, proves the very point in question, viz., that the source of the fascination that hung about him, and the personal influence he exercised, was purely spiritual and supernatural. We will take, as an instance, the following:—Catherine tells us that the Curé generally ate his one meal, such as it was,

standing; the process took about five minutes, and occasionally, to save time, he would walk off with his saucepan in his hand, finishing its contents on the way. Anyone who met him might have taken him for a beggar who had just received some broken victuals. It was always on such occasions that he was the gayest. An ecclesiastic just arrived encountered him one day when in this humour. "Are you the Curé of Ars," he asked, "whom everyone is talking about?" "Yes, my good friend, I am, indeed, the poor Curé of Ars." "Well, this is a little too much (*un peu fort*)," said the priest, walking away, and evidently greatly disappointed. "I had pictured to myself a man with an imposing air, propriety of demeanour, and becoming manners. But I have met just the reverse. This little Curé has no presence (*n'a point de dehors*); he is devoid of all dignity. He eats out in the open street like a beggar: it is a mystery altogether." These words were repeated to the holy man, who was greatly amused. He was very fond of recalling the incident. "That good gentleman," he would say, "was fairly caught; he came to Ars to see something, and he found nothing." We must add that a second interview quite reversed this ecclesiastic's judgment.

The Curé's brethren in the priesthood also made merry at his expense in the early years of his ministry, and even what we should call quizzed him unmercifully for the dilapidated costume in which he appeared at their conferences. Notwithstanding the respect with which his heroic virtue inspired them, they could not restrain a certain spirit of censure which, under the plea of advocating discreet moderation in all things, prompted them to find fault with his disregard for appearances, and for the necessary comforts of life. His "excessive penances" were the subject of animadversion, and sometimes of mortifying raillery. To their effect upon his nervous system they imputed the nightly molestations of the devil, by which his poor, short rest was broken.* "Come, come, dear Curé," they would patronizingly say, "do like other people; take a little more nourishment; it is the best way to get rid of all this devilry." Sometimes his critics would take a higher tone, and their raillery would assume the form of expostulation and reproof. By many he was treated as a visionary, and well-nigh a maniac. "Your presbytery," they said to him on one occasion, "is nothing better than a dirty, untidy barn. The rats are quite at home in it; they play their pranks night and day, and you

* The diabolical tricks which Satan played in the Curé's room for years are worth comparing with the modern "spiritual manifestations."

take them for devils." Not a word did the good Curé reply to these sage diatribes; he retired to his room, insensible to everything but the joy of having been humiliated. We must observe, in passing, that the infernal spirit took his revenge on these incredulous gentlemen. Struck by the prodigies of that night, one of the missionaries declared that he made a vow to God never more to jest at nocturnal noises and apparitions; and "as for M. le Curé d'Ars," he added, "I hold him to be a saint."

More than this, it pleased God subsequently to allow His servant to be contemned, vilified, and calumniated by his brethren. He passed through that frequent trial of saints, the persecution of good men. Some of the most influential clergy of the neighbourhood even came to the resolution of making a formal complaint to the Bishop of Belley of the imprudent zeal and mischievous enthusiasm of this ignorant and foolish curé. In his humility, M. Vianney fully believed himself to deserve their censure, and looked for nothing but an ignominious dismissal from his cure; "to be driven," as he said, "with blows out of my parish, and condemned to end my days in a prison, for having dared to stay so long in a place where I could only be a hindrance to any good." Mgr. Devie, however, was never carried away by these false impressions and reports. From the first moment he saw M. Vianney he loved him; he loved his simplicity, his poverty, his mortification. "I wish you gentlemen," he said once at a meeting of his clergy, in a tone which closed the mouths of scoffers,—“I wish you a little of that folly at which you laugh; it would do your wisdom no injury.” At another time he used these remarkable words in reply to observations upon M. Vianney's want of knowledge: "I do not know whether he be learned, but he is *enlightened*."

Ignorance and fanaticism were not the sole or the worst charges brought against this saintly man. The persecution lasted eight years. The holy priest lived it down. Two things are worthy of remark: first, that during that whole time the most embittered could scarcely retain their prejudices in his presence; the serene sanctity, the transparent simplicity of his aspect disarmed them. He could be disliked only at a distance. Secondly, it was at this very time that the Pilgrimage began to assume its gigantic proportions. And how, it may be asked, was calumny silenced? It died a natural death. It had no foundation except the malice of Satan and the imperfection of men; it died at the sight of him who was its object. Scarcely had they contemplated him, but (as M. Monnin says) the detractors of yesterday became the friends of the morrow.

Perhaps some may be disposed to wonder how the uni-

versality of the homage of which the Curé d'Ars became ultimately the object, is reconcilable with the assertion with which we started, that the world cannot appreciate sanctity, and hates poverty, self-denial, and all the ascetic virtues. Nevertheless, the honours paid to his sanctity are a well-proved, or, rather, a patent fact, while the world's hatred of asceticism is incontrovertible. After all, the contradiction is but a seeming one. It is true that, although many men hate sanctity only because they do not know it, there are a numerous class who are so wedded to the world and the gratification of their passions, that their aversion to holiness is only more prominently elicited by its personal exhibition. Yet they hate goodness, not because of its beauty, but in spite of it: they have, in fact, no eyes to discern any charms in what threatens to deprive them of the fancied good on which they have set their hearts. It is for this reason that the self-denying virtues are always odious to them. But when it pleases God to allow a ray of the inward beauty of His saints to pierce through the veil of their outward appearance, none can withhold the instinctive homage of admiration, even when the heart continues obstinate to grace.

And now we think that, much as the life of the Curé of Ars is out of the common order, it reads a lesson of great practical import to this land of mediocrity and respectability, so-called, where we imbibe, as it were, with the very air we breathe, a reverence for cold proprieties and a disposition to cautious reserve; where human respect meddles with almost every good undertaking, and, as a necessary consequence, taints, if it does not spoil, our heaven-designed works with a grovelling human prudence. It manifests and lays bare the mighty lever which can alone lift off the incubus of sin and worldliness which weighs down and holds captive the energy Divine. To kill self unsparingly, and to allow God to rebuild as we destroy—this is the simple recipe. It was that of the Curé of Ars. There is a sense in which we may do too much, while we hinder God from doing almost anything at all: we may begin at the wrong end, and set the old Adam to do the second Adam's work—with what barren results need not be said—instead of allowing the new man to kill the old, and then have it all his own way. This is to manufacture our own sanctity, such as it is, with ninety-nine grains of nature in it to one of grace. The crucifixion has never taken place; and we mistake the lively old man for the risen new one. "Sacrifice," observes M. Monnin, "is the law of intellectual and moral progress, which man realizes in himself when he becomes saintly. It is the movement of a

soul which develops itself in the direction of its noblest attributes, of a soul which expands and disengages itself" from every earthly shackle which hinders its attainment of the liberty of God's children. "Until we have renounced all created objects, the liberty of the soul is but an empty name. Like a bird detained by a thread, we may think ourselves free, but only so long as we do not try to fly. We shall then only be free when the love of Christ our Lord has liberated us."

This destruction of nature—a work, so to say, in our own hands to perform, or rather to permit—is not, as we have seen in the beautiful example before us, to stifle the natural qualities. We have witnessed the effect of this Christian discipline in enlarging and perfecting the noblest faculties of the soul; we have seen its admirable results even upon the intelligence of this naturally-ungifted man:—

The habitual union with God by prayer and love—that continual victory of the angelic over the animal, that abiding triumph of good over evil which we call the state of grace—has wonderful reactions, and works sensible effects in the intellectual portion of our being as well as in its inferior. This intellectual and moral perfecting, this enlargement of the human faculties sublimated by grace, was strikingly illustrated in M. Vianney. We have seen what he was as a young man, we have followed him in his maturity; we acknowledge, without hesitation, that he was not possessed of varied or extensive human knowledge: where or how should he have acquired it? But he had what supplies for lack of knowledge, and, if need be, for experience,—that faith which provides a man against all and teaches him everything. He had great practical wisdom, a deep insight into the ways of God and the miseries of man, an admirable sagacity, a marvellous quick-sightedness, a judicious, keen, and penetrating mind. He was gifted, moreover, with a supernatural memory—a remarkable circumstance when we recollect how unretentive that faculty originally was in the matter of study—an exquisite tact, together with a power of observation which might have arrived at being formidable to those who approached him, but for his great charity, which was ever at hand to fix its indulgent impress upon all his judgments. "There is saintliness in the Curé of Ars," observed some one in the presence of a learned professor of philosophy, "but only saintliness." "There are lights, great lights," was the reply. "They sparkle in his conversation on every subject, on God and the world, on men and on things, on the present and on the future." Another distinguished man writes, after an interview with M. Vianney: "We have been filled with admiration at the *progressive* spirit of your saint. There is nothing like sanctity for elevating the ideas of the most humble of men."

Absorbed as he was in the functions of his ministry, M. Vianney was alive to every subject of religious and social interest, and was ever ready with clear and luminous answers.

In what school this practical knowledge was acquired there can be no question; for he was profoundly and voluntarily ignorant of all the passing interests of the day. In this age of ceaseless movement, novelty, and progress, the Curé of Ars entertained no desire, felt no anxiety, to know anything of that world the figure of which passed away around him without his paying it the least attention, so fixed was his mind on another object. "You allude to the railroad sometimes," it was said to him; "do you know anything about it?" "No, nor do I desire: I speak of it because I hear others speak of it." In fact, he had never seen that wonder of modern practical science which brought two or three hundred strangers to visit him every day; he lived and died without seeing a railway or having a notion of what it was like. His soul, like some angelic being, was ever soaring above the region of vulgar interests. "He regarded everything from the point of view which is familiar to the saints, and where light without a shadow dwells. Conscience was his sole horizon. The external world was as if it existed not for him." But all that came from the other and Divine world, the kingdom of God in His Church, and all that could concern the glory of his Lord or the good of souls, found even a passionate response in his heart, causing every fibre of his soul, as it were, to vibrate, and making his tongue eloquent, though ever with that homely, familiar language and charming simplicity which never left him.

But if this interior work enlarges the intellect, so also does it expand the heart,—a point on which the world is always sceptical, imputing, as it does, to mortification and asceticism a blighting influence on the natural affections. This man, so hard to himself, who bore in his person the traces of the most terrible penances, was remarkable for his winning amiability. There was nothing stern or austere in his demeanour; though never seen to laugh, a smile at once sweet and radiant would often illuminate his countenance. There was a grace and a seasonableness in his rejoinders which partook of the savour of wit, without that sharpness or pungency which is its frequent accompaniment on less holy lips. His biographer gives many pleasing examples of his sympathy, his kind considerateness, his delicate tact, his overflowing tenderness, and his love for his friends. We have observed that the Curé of Ars had never received the artificial polish which education can impart even to those whose heart remains uncivilized; but he possessed that true politeness which is all "steeped in charity, cordiality, and sincerity," and which set every one at his ease. After the example of Him in

whom grace and goodness first manifested themselves, the servant of God thought of all, gave an eye to all, forgetting only and altogether self. He needed nothing, not even consolation or marks of sympathy; he held himself unworthy of them. True sweetness and amiability, from which genuine politeness flows, are, in fact, as M. Monnin suggests, portions of self-renunciation and self-sacrifice; they are the flower of humility.

Perhaps there is no lesson more important than that which may be derived from the contemplation of the continued life of prayer which this saint of our day was called to lead. We live in times of restless activity, continual anxiety, multiplicity of business. As we traverse space, so we seem to pass through time, with the hurry of a locomotive. It would be unjust to deny that there is much earnest piety among us, much warmth of devotion, and frequency at prayer; but what shall we say of those prolonged hours of converse with God by which the work of grace has been fortified in the saints, as by repeated deep draughts of the very elixir of spiritual life? Such persevering assiduity in prayer may doubtless be found in the cloister; but in the world no one seems to have time for it. It is out of keeping with all our modern habits and ways. In the early part of his ministry M. Vianney spent long consecutive hours in prayer; afterwards *he* certainly had not time; but the habit of continued prayer was now interwoven into his existence; his eye was never off God, his heart was perpetually inundated with His love. But such a habit can never be acquired in any measure without some cultivation of that interior life which, in the saint's own expressive words, "is a bath of love, into which the soul plunges, and in which she is as it were drowned in love;" and of this interior life, prayer—not the mere *saying of prayers*—is the very breath. This alone will enable us, in these busy, distracting times, when our avocations, whether charitable or others, make an inroad upon our stated hours of devotion, to supply for the loss, and keep the flame of Divine love burning bright in the heart. Many more persons, perhaps, are capable of a simpler mode of prayer—of course we are not speaking here of any supernatural kind, which no effort of our own can teach us—than they imagine; and so God would lead them to it if they permitted Him.

"It is not necessary," said the Curé, "to talk so much in order to pray well. We know that our good God is there in the tabernacle; we open our heart to Him; we are happy at being in His presence: that is the best sort of prayer. It was the prayer of that good M. Vidaut. He used to go as soon

as the church was open to adore the Blessed Sacrament. One day that he was at the château, they had to summon him three times to breakfast. The mistress of the house was getting impatient. At the third summons he left our Lord's presence, exclaiming, 'My God, cannot they leave one in peace to spend a moment with Thee?'" and the Curé added, weeping, "He had been there since four in the morning. There are good Christians who could pass their whole lives thus lost in God. Happy they!"

He was himself of the blessed number. This sort of prayer is manifestly the only kind which human nature is capable of prolonging to any extent, and it is also the only kind by which we can acquire the habit of continually praying whilst otherwise engaged.

We cannot close our notice with a more opportune observation than the following:—

The love of God in the Curé d'Ars produced another love, less understood, less known, and which, nevertheless, is the infallible fruit of the first in truly Catholic hearts—the love of the Church, that venerable Mother so dear to the children of God, the Spouse of our Lord, bought with His Blood, sprung from His Wounds, and in whom He lives by His truth, His word, His grace, His sacraments. This love in the Curé d'Ars included implicitly all that the Church, represented by her head, loves, accepts, and proposes. You had but to name Rome to him to elicit flashes of joy, or tears, or sighs, or regrets that he should die before beholding the native country of souls, the reliquary of the world, the tomb of apostles and martyrs.

We repeat our cordial wish to see M. Monnin's volumes translated *in extenso*. We have been compelled to restrict ourselves almost exclusively to one point, which we feel has been most inadequately treated, and have found room for few quotations. The work is not only most interesting, as a full biography of the most remarkable man of our day, but is a treasury of religious edification and instruction.

ART. III.—PRISON MINISTERS ACT.

An Act for the Amendment of the Law relating to the Religious Instruction of Prisoners in County and Borough Prisons in England and Scotland.
 London : Printed by George Edward Eyre & William Spottiswoode,
 Printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty. 1863.

IT is our pleasant task to have to record a step taken in the right direction. Our legislators are employed in the very necessary work of freeing the statute-book from obsolete laws. Some such there are which, nominally at least, inflict disabilities upon Catholics; but whether they are included among those which are henceforth to disappear from the statute-book, we are unable to say. Neither is it a matter of any practical moment. For although they still hold their place in the records of Parliament and the written laws of the realm, they have long been a dead letter, and could not have been put in force against us. Their repeal, therefore, is to be desired rather with a view to removing a national disgrace than as conferring any actual benefit on us, whom they could never practically injure.

This, however, is not the step in the right direction to which we wish to draw our readers' attention. Unfortunately there are still laws in existence which are by no means obsolete, and the practical bearing of which on the social position of Catholics is of no light import. There are still certain points in which we Catholics are placed in an inferior social position to our fellow-subjects, and in which we are debarred from an appeal to the courts of law when we are not treated as Protestants are, and have a legal right to be treated. Such laws especially affect those of our co-religionists who occupy the lowest ranks in the community. The upper classes amongst us have fought the battle for themselves, and have obtained their liberation from almost every legal disability under which they lay, even far into the present century. But it is not until very lately that we have made our voice heard in behalf of those who, professing a common faith with ourselves, have none but us to plead for them and to defend their cause. It is true that the laws to which we refer are not professedly penal laws. They do not speak of Catholics as such, nor do they solemnly provide that Catholics and Protestants shall not enjoy equal rights and privileges; but they were enacted when

our very existence was all but ignored. Thus, the laws relating to workhouses and prisons have hitherto almost assumed that there were no such people as Catholics amongst the classes for whom they were framed. Not that we were forgotten altogether; but clauses of such a character were introduced, regarding us simply as a possible exception, and such scanty provision was made in our regard, that the inequality of our position was rendered even more glaring by the little that was conceded to us, than, to all appearance, it would have been if we had been entirely overlooked. In the latter case it might have seemed that the Legislature would not have refused us the equality that was our right if we had been known to be at hand to claim it; but, instead of this, all that the law did for us was just enough to show that it recognized our existence, but was determined not to acknowledge us as the equals of those for whom its enactments were framed. In these laws, as we have said, Catholics were not mentioned by name; but a certain slight degree of liberty was granted to a pauper, or a prisoner, of absenting himself from the services of the National Church in case of his professing a religion differing from that by law established. In fact, we were ranked amongst the Dissenters; but as it happened that Dissenters took no interest whatever in the destitute or criminal classes, and have rather shown an inclination to disown all unfortunates who, by their misfortune or their fault, might come to the workhouse or the gaol, these provisions practically affected Catholics alone. Hence, in the recent debates in the last session of Parliament, during the discussions upon the Act the title of which we have prefixed to our present article, though the Bill apparently referred to all who were not members of the Established Church, it was admitted on all hands that in reality its enactments applied only to Catholics. Socially speaking, our difficulty has lain principally in this difference between Catholics and Dissenters, that we alone care for the poor, and that we have, while the Dissenters have not, a very large number of poor of our religion for whom we are bound to care. So that, in reality, paupers and prisoners are divided into only two classes, Protestants and Catholics; of whom the former are content enough with such religious ministrations as are afforded by the Established Church, so far as they care for any religious ministrations at all. On the one hand, this indifference on the part of Dissenters to all who are not in "respectable" circumstances tells in our favour thus far, that guardians of the poor and visiting justices need fear no irruption into the prisons or workhouses under their charge, of ministers of all or any of the various — we might almost say

innumerable—dissenting sects ; but, on the other hand, it has been disadvantageous to us in this respect, that we have had to fight the battle of our poor, not only unassisted, but labouring under the burden of an unpopularity the effect of which has been to blind people to the manifest injustice of which we have had so much reason to complain.

The readers of this REVIEW will recollect that on a previous occasion* attention was drawn at considerable length to the grievances to which the Catholic inmates of workhouses are subjected ; seeing that while, by the existing regulations, ample provision is made for the religious wants of their Protestant fellow-countrymen, to themselves the exercise of their religion is encumbered with difficulties. An attempt was made at the same time to convey some idea of the scale on which the Poor Law had become a vast machinery for the proselytising of pauper Catholic children. Our present task is to place before our readers the spiritual condition of Catholic prisoners, and to show that, while the Prison Ministers Act is, as we have been glad to call it, a step in the right direction, it is yet but a step, and not that complete establishment of religious equality which we had hoped to secure. But before we enter into the necessary details on this subject, we will describe the present position of what is called amongst us, "The Workhouse Question," and state what has been done for the Catholic pauper since the appearance of the article to which we have referred.

Here, too, a step in advance may be said to have been made, though it is not as yet a step in legislation. All that is needful on our part as a preliminary to legislation has been done ; for a full statement of our grievances has been laid before Parliament. An account of the way in which this has been effected will show how the matter now stands, and how it is that no results have as yet ensued from a proceeding that entailed so much labour and expense.

The boards of guardians throughout the country are subject to a central authority, of which they are extremely jealous. This department of the Government is called the Poor-Law Board, and its Chief Commissioner, or President, has a seat in the Cabinet. This Board has, curiously enough, no permanent existence, but its large powers are from time to time renewed by Act of Parliament. When in 1860 it had to come to Parliament for a fresh lease of authority, its opponents took advantage of this opportunity to strike a blow at its existence. They

* DUBLIN REVIEW, No. XCVI., August, 1860.

were so far successful that the five years for which the Government asked were not granted, and the Continuance Act was passed for three years only, and that on the express understanding that a select committee of the House of Commons should during those three years make a full inquiry into all the complaints that had been brought against the Board. To that committee our petitions against the injustice of the working of the Poor Law were also referred, a very considerable number of petitions from Catholics having been presented to both Houses of Parliament.

The committee was fairly chosen from both Parliamentary parties, and it numbered among its members the President of the Poor-Law Board and the three English Catholics who have seats in the House of Commons. Evidence was taken during the session of 1860; and the committee was reappointed, and resumed the hearing of evidence through the sessions of 1861 and 1862. This it reported from time to time to the House of Commons in six blue books, of which the evidence relating to Catholics occupies the third. Eight Catholics in all were examined by the committee, of whom four were priests and four laymen. The Report also contains the evidence of four adverse Protestants, one of whom was the secretary of the Protestant Alliance; of the master of a metropolitan workhouse, also a Protestant, who had formerly been the master of a workhouse in the provinces, which was strongly in our favour; and of a poor-law inspector, whose evidence was rather for us than against us.

The committee spent eight of its sittings in receiving this evidence, and the volume contains the answers of the witnesses to more than three thousand questions. It will be seen, therefore, that the subject was thoroughly sifted, and it is a pleasure to be able to add that the Catholic witnesses were listened to by the committee and questioned by its members with the most perfect fairness and impartiality. The ultra-Protestant newspapers complained, but without any reason or justice, that a bias was shown in our favour; but they would have been sure to make the same complaint unless our witnesses had been browbeaten and our case suppressed. For that fair and equitable treatment our thanks are due to the committee, and to the Right Hon. C. P. Villiers, the President of the Poor-Law Board, who was its chairman. In the session of Parliament which has just closed, the committee was reappointed, having no work before it but to report to the House on the subjects on which it had taken evidence; but it met only once, and then resolved to advise the House to reappoint the committee in the next session of Parliament. Meanwhile, as the

three years had elapsed for which the Poor-Law Board had received its powers, another Continuance Act for a single year has been passed. Next year, no doubt, unless prevented by a dissolution of Parliament, the committee will report to the House of Commons its opinion of our claims. Until this has been done we must rest contented with having effected for our poor Catholic brothers and sisters in the workhouses all that it was in our power to do, and with having secured for the whole of the sad story a permanent record.

When it was known that the "Workhouse Question" was to be examined into by a committee of the House of Commons, no one would ever have imagined that the parallel prison grievance would be the first to receive a remedy from the Legislature. It would seem probable that the two grievances have helped one another. There can be no doubt that the impression prevailing in the minds of those who have the power to help us was, that we were always making complaints in general terms, but that we were unable to establish any specific grievances; and they probably supposed that the shortest way to silence us was to give us an opportunity of proving our assertions. We believe that the strength of the case produced before the Select Committee on the English Poor Law occasioned no little surprise; and as the general statement of our grievances was supported by a long array of instances, related in detail, which have been left unanswered, we may presume that they are allowed to be unanswerable. The surprise created by the unexpected revelation of the hardships endured by the Catholic pauper has no doubt greatly assisted the cause of the Catholic prisoner. And, in return, we may hope that the spirit and determination shown by the House of Commons to remedy a grievance when it was clearly pointed out, in the case of the prisoners, will encourage the friends of the paupers to persevere in their exertions.

Mr. Henley expressed this view of the matter in a very manly and straightforward way in his speech on the second reading of the Prison Ministers Bill. He said that the parliamentary returns moved for by Lord Edward Howard "had thrown great light on the subject, and he was confident that when the House had full information before it, it would never refuse to deal honestly and justly with any case." From these returns we shall be enabled not only to place before our readers the number of prisoners in whose behalf this Act of Parliament has just been passed, but to present a considerable portion of the grievance under which we laboured, and which this Act is intended to remedy, in the very words of the prison officials themselves. And as there is an interest

in the statistics, apart from the argument they have afforded for legislative interference, we will produce at the same time the similar returns which were moved for by the late Mr. Lucas in 1853. The interval between the two returns is nearly ten years, *i. e.* from September 25, 1852, to January 1, 1862.

In the convict prisons in England (Mr. Lucas's return relates to England only)*—

In 1852 there were 693 Catholics, out of 6,445 prisoners.

In 1862 " 1,426 " 7,682 "

In the borough and county gaols (excepting Clerkenwell, Cold Bath Fields† and Bath, which, having made no return in 1862, we have deducted from the tables of 1852, for the sake of comparison)—

In 1852 there were 2,040 Catholics, out of 13,767 prisoners.

In 1862 " 2,702 " 15,964 "

Or, altogether, in English prisons—

In 1852 there were 2,733 Catholics, out of 20,212 prisoners.

In 1862 " 4,128 " 23,646 "

That is to say, in English convict prisons—

In 1852 the Catholics were about 10·7 per cent.

In 1862 " " 19·3 "

And in English county and borough gaols—

In 1852 the Catholics were about 14·9 per cent.

In 1862 " " 16·9 "

This increase of proportion is very remarkable; but still more remarkable is the very large proportion of Catholics among the female convicts, consisting of more than 30·5 per cent. of the whole number.

At Millbank in 1862 there were 94 Catholics out of 422 women.

At Brixton " 234 " 624 "

At Fulham " 60 " 226 "

Or, in all, 388 " 1,272 "

* In 1862 there were in the Welch prisons 80 Catholics out of 531 prisoners, or 15 per cent.; and in the Scotch prisons 533 Catholics out of 2,276 prisoners, or 23·4 per cent.: the proportion in total English prisons being 17·4.

† In 1852 there were in Cold Bath Fields 214 Catholics out of 1,166 prisoners. In 1862, the governor says, "Number of prisoners of each religious denomination, on January 1, 1862, not being recorded, owing to the large number of prisoners here, cannot be defined." The new Act will render such a report impossible for the future, as it makes registration of a prisoner's religion compulsory. He adds: "Number of prisoners, not being members of the Established Church, who have requested the attendance of a minister of their religion, or who have been visited by one during the previous three months, was 49." These were probably Catholics; and, perhaps, less than a quarter of the Catholics in the prison.

Inasmuch as Millbank is the prison to which the more refractory women are sent, it is something of a comfort to find that the Catholic inmates are in a smaller proportion. Here there are 2 Catholic women in every 9; but at Brixton, we are told, to our great astonishment, that of every 8 women 3 are Catholics, or more than 37 per cent. of the whole number of inmates.

If we deduct the numbers of the women from the totals of convict prisoners given above, we find that there were 1,038 Catholics among the 6,410 convict men, that is, about 16 per cent. It would seem impossible to attribute the smallness of the proportion of Catholics amongst the men as compared with the women, to any other cause than a greater reluctance on the part of the men to avow their religion in prison.

It was stated before the Poor-Relief Committee, that the Catholics in London are about 1 in 12 of the whole population, or probably 1 in 7 of the classes from which the inmates of workhouses and gaols are principally taken. One in 7 is about 14 per cent., and that this estimate is not exaggerated is pretty conclusively shown by the fact that the Catholics in the convict prisons, which are supplied by no means exclusively from places where Catholics form as large a portion of the population as they do in the metropolis, are more than 19 per cent. of the whole number.

The returns obtained by Lord Edward Howard give us information on other points besides the mere number of Catholics in each prison. From them we are able to draw no small amount of information respecting the religious treatment of these prisoners. We gather that a considerable degree of freedom was given to the priests in the way of visiting Catholic prisoners at Wisbeach (2),* Chester County (38), Knutsford (61), Essex County at Springfield (17), Kent County at Maidstone (45), Stafford County (94), Southampton County at Winchester (54), Glamorgan County at Cardiff (24), and, apparently, at Newcastle (63), Chester City (5), and Gloucester County (13), Gaols. It is consolatory to be able to present such a list, for it disposes us to hope that amongst so many boards of visiting justices who have been acting in a spirit of fairness (and we trust there are many others to whom the returns give us no clue), several may be found to put the Prison Ministers Act into early operation.

But these, unfortunately, were cases of exceptional liberality.

* We have added to the name of the gaol the number of Catholic prisoners.

In the vast majority of prisons, the first step had to be taken by the prisoner himself. He had to ask for the priest; and, if he lacked either the proper disposition or the courage to induce him to make the necessary effort, he was left without the influence for good that might have been brought to bear upon his mind by the exhortations of one whom, and whom alone, he believed to be the messenger of God. We are shown in these returns the extent of the evil that was wrought by the law that permitted, and was supposed to direct and require, this state of things. We believe that the extracts we are about to give will be found useful by the clergy, and by such Catholics as occupy positions of influence in the various places mentioned, as the number of Catholics in the prisons, until these returns were made, was entirely unknown to them. Inaccuracies have, here and there, been pointed out; but, on the whole, we have thought it best simply to reproduce the statements that have been presented to Parliament. We pass over the convict prisons for the present, confining our attention to the county and borough gaols. We have arranged them in order, according to the number of Catholics they are said to contain, separating the Scottish prisons from those of England and Wales. It will be remembered that we have already given the number of Catholics in eleven gaols. These we do not here repeat.

Liverpool Borough Gaol: Catholics, 485.—“Number of such prisoners, not being members of the Established Church, who during the previous three months have requested the attendance of a minister of their religion, or have been visited by one, 36. A Roman Catholic priest attends (though not appointed) when any prisoner of that denomination requires his services. He generally attends twice a week.”

Manchester City Gaol: Catholics, 207.—“Number of prisoners requiring a clergyman of their own persuasion during the previous three months, 3 Roman Catholics.”

Westminster House of Correction: Catholics, 183.—“Number who . . . have requested . . . or been visited, 88 Roman Catholics.”

Salford, New Bailey Prison: Catholics, 147.—“Number . . . who were visited by their minister during the months of October, November, and December, 1861, 50 Roman Catholics.”

Kirkdale Borough Gaol: Catholics, 141.—“Catholics visited by a minister of their own denomination during the last three months of 1861, 88.”

Wakefield Borough Prison: Catholics, 139.—“Number . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited, 53.”

Wandsworth House of Correction: Catholics, 124.—“Number of those who applied . . . 23 Roman Catholics, 3 Jews.”

Preston House of Correction: Catholics, 77.—“Number . . . who have requested . . . or been visited, 15 Roman Catholics.”

Holloway, City of London Prison: Catholics, 67.—“Number who have requested . . . or have been visited, *none*.”

Birmingham Borough Prison: Catholics, 67.—“Number who have requested . . . Roman Catholics, 14 males, 4 females.”

Durham County Gaol: Catholics, 63.—“During the previous three months, one Dissenter requested the attendance of a minister of his own religion, and his request was granted.”

Leeds Borough Gaol: Catholics, 56.—“Number . . . who have requested . . . or been visited . . . 4; 2 males and 2 females.”

Northallerton Borough Prison: Catholics, 38.—“Number . . . who requested, 3. One clergyman of the Church of England appointed to instruct the prisoners in the previous year. No other religious instructors officiate, excepting those who are sent for at the special request of any prisoner.”

Exeter, Devon County Prison: Catholics, 33.—“Number . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited . . . 7 Roman Catholics.”

Kingston-upon-Hull, Borough Gaol: Catholics, 32.—“Number . . . who requested or received visits . . . one request and one visit by a Roman Catholic priest, in a case of childbirth.”

Lancaster County Gaol: Catholics, 30.—“During the three months preceding 1st January, 1862, a Roman Catholic priest made three visits, seeing in all six prisoners. A Wesleyan minister visited one prisoner six times.”

Warwick County Gaol: Catholics, 27.—“Prisoners . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited, 8.”

Salop County Gaol: Catholics, 23.—“Roman Catholics. Five were visited by a Roman Catholic priest, at their own request, during the previous three months.”

Swansea Borough Gaol: Catholics, 23.—“Prisoners requesting spiritual advice from other ministers:—Roman Catholics, 2; Jew, 1. The Jewish rabbi or Roman Catholic priest attends gratuitously at the special request of the prisoners.”

Derby County and Borough Gaol: Catholics, 22.—“Number . . . who have requested . . . *none*. Number . . . who have been visited . . . 6 Roman Catholics.”

Dorchester, Dorset County Gaol: Catholics, 21.—“One prisoner (of the Roman Catholic Church) only had requested the attendance of a minister of that religion during the

previous three months. The chaplain and schoolmaster are the only appointed instructors who officiate in the prison to promote the reformation of the prisoners."

Leicester County Prison: Catholics, 18.—"Number . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited, 12 Roman Catholics."

Horsemonger Lane, Surrey County Gaol: Catholics, 17.—"Number . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited, *nil*."

Lewes, Sussex County Prison: Catholics, 15.—"None of these had either requested to see or had seen any minister of any religion (except the chaplain of the prison) during the last three months."

Portsmouth Borough Gaol: Catholics, 15.—"Number . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited, *nil*."

Morpeth, Northumberland County Gaol and House of Correction: Catholics, 14.—"Number visited by a minister of their own religious denomination:—Established Church of England, 64" [this is the number of members of the Church of England in the prison, the total number of prisoners being 85]; "Roman Catholics, 9."

Southampton Borough Gaol: Catholics, 14.—"No request has been made for the attendance of (or visits made by) any other minister than of the Established Church."

Nottingham Borough Gaol and House of Correction: Catholics, 14.—"No prisoner has requested the attendance of a minister of his own religion, nor has any prisoner been visited by one."

Worcester County Gaol: Catholics, 12.—"Number . . . who have requested . . . and who were visited:—3 Roman Catholics, who were visited by the Roman Catholic priest, who resides at the Worcester Roman Catholic chapel-house."

Canterbury, County Gaol and House of Correction: Catholics, 12.—"Number . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited, *none*."

York City, House of Correction: Catholics, 11.—"Number . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited, *none*."

York County Gaol: Catholics, 11.—"Eight of these requested the attendance of their minister, and were visited by one."

Bristol, City Bridewell: Catholics, 10.—"Prisoners who . . . have requested . . . or have been visited, 1 Roman Catholic."

Plymouth, Borough Prison: Catholics, 10.—"Number . . . who have requested . . . or have been visited, *nil*. Number of clergymen . . . appointed or officiating during the previous year, to promote the reformation of the prisoners of each

denomination, through the instrumentality of their own respective creeds :—1 clergyman of the Church of England, appointed the prison chaplain; 1 clergyman of the Church of Rome, officiating with one prisoner, who had sent for him."

Usk Borough Gaol: Catholics, 10.—"Prisoners who have been visited at their own request 8 Roman Catholics."

The returns from Scotland are given in a tabular form :—

Glasgow	173 Catholics.	Number visited	3
Perth General Prison	156	"	25
Edinburgh	57	"	<i>nil.</i>
Hamilton	22	"	<i>nil.</i>
Airdrie	18	"	2
Paisley	14	"	<i>nil.</i>
Dundee	14	"	6
Linlithgow	12	"	<i>nil.</i>

We have not considered it necessary to continue our list through the remaining prisons,* where the Catholics are under 10 in number. But we beg our readers' special attention to the statements which have here been laid before Parliament by the authorities of the gaols themselves. In order to perceive the full force of these figures, it is necessary to notice that the inquiry as to the number of Catholics in a prison, and of the inquiry as to the number of those who have asked for and have been visited by a priest, do not relate to the same term. The number of Catholics given is that of those present on a certain day, Jan. 1st, 1862; but the number visited extends over the previous three months. Probably York County Gaol is the only exception to this in the returns. If all the Catholics had been visited, the number ought to have been greater than that of those present on one particular day, as in the course of a quarter of a year many must have been discharged, and others received. Thus we see that at Newcastle-upon-Tyne there are 63 Catholics returned as in the

* County and Borough Gaols in England and Wales.

Prisons making no return	3	-
" in which there are no prisoners	9	
" " no Catholics	27	Catholics.
" " less than 10 Catholics	56	containing	185	
" " 10 and less than 20	16	"	213	
" " 20 " 50	12	"	356	
" " 50 " 100	9	"	602	
" " 100 or more	7	"	1426	
			<hr/>	
			139	2782

Borough Prison on the 1st of January, while the "number of prisoners who have requested the attendance of ministers of their religion during the previous three months is 67." Some of these *may* be Dissenters, of whom there were 16 in the prison; but the Kent County Prison at Maidstone furnishes a clear case. In that gaol there were 45 Catholics on the 1st of January, but the number of prisoners visited is returned as 89 Roman Catholics. Again, from the returns of Fulham Refuge we see that of the number visited by the priest during the last quarter of the year, about one-third had left the prison by New Year's Day, and must, therefore, be added to the sum total of Catholics given if we would form a true estimate of the proportion visited. Fulham returns its Catholics as 60; number visited during the three months, 52; number of those who were present at the end of the year who were visited, 33. So that we see that, of the 60 Catholics the number who did *not* see the priest was really 27, and not 8 only, as we should have supposed if we had not been furnished with this further information.

More remarkable still is the case of the Glamorgan County Gaol at Cardiff, where the number of Catholics is given as 24, while the number visited during the three months was "92—all Roman Catholics." Here, we are told, the priest "visits the prisoners of his denomination once a week," evidently without any special request on their part; and thus Cardiff forms a striking contrast to the neighbouring Borough Gaol at Swansea, where of 23 Catholics only two "requested spiritual advice" from the priest.

On the other hand, some little deduction must be made for the few cases in which the returns give us the number who have made special requests, but not the number of those actually visited. The return from Derby, for example, is evidently inaccurate; and it is quite impossible that in the Manchester City Gaol only 3 Catholics out of 207 were visited by the priest. Yet this qualification applies to very few cases; for in no less than 28 out of the 35 instances we have given, the return states expressly the number, not only of those who have requested, but of those who *have been visited* by a priest. With these considerations in his mind, which show that on the whole the number is much understated, the reader will perceive the force of the argument furnished by Lord Edward Howard's returns, when he observes that in the 35 county or borough gaols we have enumerated, in which there were acknowledged to be 2,188 Catholic prisoners, only 440 are reported as having been visited by a priest. The number of Catholics in the 11 prisons named above, in which,

if we may judge by the returns, free access to the Catholic prisoners is permitted to the priest, is altogether 416. To complete the total, we have to mention that there are 178 more prisoners returned as Catholics whose state is not likely to be improved by the fact of their having but few, if any, fellow Catholics with them in prison.

We now turn to the convict prisons; but as the abuse which in the borough and county gaols has yet to be remedied by the help of the Prison Ministers Act, has in the convict prisons been remedied already, we need not enter into the same details in their case. They are, as our readers are probably aware, under the authority of the Home Secretary. They are managed by Government officials, who are called the Directors of Convict Prisons. Of this board the late Sir Joshua Jebb was chairman, with whose name the discussions on the ticket-of-leave system have made the public familiar. This department of the Government has full authority to make all necessary regulations for the management of the prisons, while the powers of the visiting justices are limited by the Acts of Parliament; and in the matter of religion it was maintained, before the passing of the Prison Ministers Act, that they could not concede to the Catholic inmates a greater amount of liberty than the said Acts allowed. In the case of some few prisons, as we have seen, the visiting justices did not regard themselves as being thus fettered; but, generally speaking, it was believed that with respect to borough and county prisons nothing but an Act of Parliament could confer what we wanted. It was rather, therefore, to the Home Secretary that we looked for the inauguration of a better system than that which had so long prevailed.

The first grievance, which is indeed the foundation of all the rest, was the position and authority of the Protestant chaplain. A clergyman of the Church of England, holding an official position in the prison, who was enabled by the enjoyment of a good salary to devote his entire time to his prison duties, and who, in many instances, was supported by an assistant chaplain and Scripture readers, had unlimited access to, and entire charge of, all the prisoners, Catholics as well as Protestants. The first step towards the remedy of this abuse was evidently taken by the Home Office before Lord Edward Howard's return was moved for. At Millbank, we are told, "the chaplains and the Scripture reader of the Church of England instruct all denominations except the Church of Rome;" and the same exception is expressly made at Woking. In the other convict prisons at that time the old system appears to have still prevailed. And in all other respects the same

grievances existed in the convict prisons that we have pointed out in the prisons of counties and boroughs. At Pentonville, out of 73 Catholics, only 12 had requested the attendance of their priest in three months; at Parkhurst there were 27 Catholics, none of whom had been "visited by ministers not of the Established Church;" of the 180 Catholics at Dartmoor, "about 60" used to see the priest on his weekly visit; of 124 Catholic convicts at Wakefield, 39 had been visited; and, saddest case of all, at Portland there were during three months 216 Catholics, of whom 151 "requested the attendance of a minister of their religion," while the number actually visited during the same period was only one. Portsmouth Prison seems to have been conducted more liberally, as, of the 88 Catholics there, the returns say, "The whole of these have been visited by a Roman Catholic priest."

The return from which we have so copiously quoted was moved for by Lord Edward Howard during the session of 1862; but the authentic information thus obtained was not the only advantage gained for us during that session for which we are indebted to his zeal. It was abundantly clear that, if the Catholic religion was to be brought to bear upon Catholic prisoners, and become, in any systematic way, instrumental in their reformation, some provision must be made to enable the Catholic clergy to devote sufficient time for the purpose. Already a considerable amount of work was done by priests in the convict prisons which was public service, and deserved remuneration. They who raised their altars there, and served them, had a right to live off their altars. Mass had been said for some years in Brixton Prison and in the female prison called Fulham Refuge; and at Millbank a priest attended the men every Wednesday and Sunday, and the women every Friday and Sunday throughout the year. It was, therefore, not surprising that, when Lord Edward Howard pressed upon the Home Office the spiritual wants of the convicts, the Government should have considered that the proper beginning would be to propose to Parliament a money vote for the purpose of supplying them. This was not altogether a novelty, even in England. In Mr. Lucas's return, in 1852, it is stated that, at Dartmoor, "a priest (not an officer of the establishment) is allowed one guinea for each visit; the sum thus paid in the year ending 25 September, 1852, amounted to £46. 4s." And at Millbank, "One priest at £50 *per annum*." However, even these small allowances were soon withdrawn. In 1854, in consequence of a speech made by Mr. Lucas in the previous session, Lord Palmerston proposed in the estimates a grant of £550 for the religious expenses of Catholics in convict prisons.

But it is one of the curious fashions in our parliamentary proceedings, that votes of money "in supply" are usually decided by some forty or fifty members; and when Lord Palmerston's proposal was made, in a house reduced to such dimensions, the bigots mustered in force, the Irish members were absent, and the vote was lost. It was thought that, after this adverse decision, even the allowance that had been made, as the return of 1852 shows, for travelling expenses, should be discontinued; and thus the priest who visited Dartmoor for the last eight years has done so at the expense of the Catholics of Plymouth; and the priest who has for the same period attended Millbank has been maintained by the Catholics of Westminster.

The proposition of the Government, in 1862, to devote £550*, to enable them to provide for the religious instruction of Catholic convicts, did not, of course, pass without opposition. Mr. Selwyn, who in the subsequent session spoke strongly against the Prison Ministers Bill, moved the rejection of the vote, but was defeated by a majority of 38 to 16. This is the first benefit that our poor Catholic prisoners received from Sir George Grey, but it is neither the last nor the greatest.

The representations of Lord Edward Howard to the Home Office, as to the injustice towards Catholics of the system pursued in all the English prisons, was productive of the happiest effect; and he had the pleasure of announcing to a meeting of Catholic gentlemen deeply interested in the subject, that the Cabinet had consented to the proposal of Sir George Grey for a reformation of the entire system, as far as such reformation was in the power of the Government without a fresh Act of Parliament. Before long, the following papers were sent by the Home Office to the Directors of the Convict Prisons, to be at once introduced into practice :—

CONVICT PRISONS.

Rules applicable to the Religious Instruction of Roman Catholic Prisoners.

1. So long as an allowance is granted by Parliament for the religious instruction of Roman Catholic prisoners, the following Rules shall be in force :—

A Roman Catholic priest may be nominated by the Secretary of State to visit Roman Catholic prisoners, such nomination to continue in force during the pleasure of the Secretary of State.

2. A record will be kept of each prisoner's religion.

The following notice will be suspended in the reception ward and the Governor's office, and the instructions contained in it will be adhered to in the case of all prisoners. (*Notice attached.*)

* This grant is divided amongst five priests in England, and one in Scotland, in sums varying from £100 to £30 a year.

3. The priest will have access to the Reception Ward Book, and facilities will be afforded him for the performance of Divine worship, and reading daily prayers, at such hours, and under such arrangements, as may be consistent with the observance of the rules and the discipline and order of the prison.

4. No Roman Catholic prisoner shall be compelled to attend any religious service performed by the chaplain, and every such prisoner shall be at liberty to attend the religious services performed by the priest.

5. Subject to the general arrangements for the discipline and safe custody of the prisoners, the priest will have access to the Roman Catholic prisoners in their cells, and be furnished with a key for this purpose.

6. The prison chaplains and Scripture readers will not visit Roman Catholic prisoners, neither will the Roman Catholic priest visit Protestant prisoners.

7. The teaching in school shall be confined to secular subjects, as regards Roman Catholic prisoners.

8. The letters to or from Roman Catholic prisoners will be read by the governor or deputy-governor only.

Notice concerning a Prisoner's Religion.

1. Prisoners who declare themselves to be Roman Catholics will be considered Roman Catholic prisoners, and be registered accordingly in a Reception Ward Book.

2. A Roman Catholic priest attends at the prison, and all Roman Catholic prisoners will have the opportunity afforded them of attending the Roman Catholic services and being visited by the priest.

Instructions.

1. When the above Notice has been read and explained, and each prisoner understands it, he will declare whether he is Protestant or Roman Catholic.

2. The governor or deputy-governor will then cause to be entered in the separate Reception Ward Book, opposite each name, the following remarks :—

A. B.—“ Has read, or has heard read and explained, the contents of the Notice respecting a prisoner's religion.”

A. B.—“ Is a Protestant ” (or) “ is a Roman Catholic.”

3. The entries will be made by a clerk from the governor's office, and will be signed by the governor or deputy-governor, and countersigned by the clerk.

The first of the representations made to Sir George Grey had been to the effect, that the Catholic prisoners were so deeply impressed with a sense of the disadvantages which their profession of the Catholic religion entailed upon them, that something was needed to reassure the poor creatures, in order that, on first entering the prison, they might tell the truth, and be registered as Catholics, if they really were so. The next boon to be obtained was, that the Catholics might be entirely exempted from the spiritual charge and pastoral visits of the clergyman of the Established Church who filled the office

of chaplain, and from all interference on the part of the Scripture readers, whose position was likewise official. Thirdly, that no request should be necessary on the part of any Catholic prisoner in order that he might be visited by a priest. Fourthly, that a priest should receive all the requisite facilities to enable him to perform towards the Catholics all the duties which the chaplain of the gaol was empowered to discharge towards the Protestants. How liberally and completely all these points were conceded will be seen by a glance at the new regulations given above. The Catholics were entirely liberated from the superintendence of the Protestant clergyman, including the by no means unimportant detail of the examination of their letters, which hitherto might pass through his hands, even though addressed to the prisoner's confessor. Only one rule, the 4th, could be said to be worded in an unsatisfactory manner, for it seemed to permit the Catholic prisoners to attend the Protestant service if they chose, and to absent themselves from the services and ministrations of the Catholic priest; but Sir Joshua Jebb distinctly stated, that it was intended that the Catholics should be subject, with regard to their religion, to the same discipline to which the Protestants were amenable. It was further promised that one or two minor points, which had also been included in the grievances detailed, such as the condition of the prison libraries, should be effectually remedied.

This was in every way a most important step. The principle for which Catholics had so long been contending, and which had been previously conceded, not only in Ireland, but in the English army and in the military prisons, was now fully admitted in the convict prisons also. By the issue of these regulations, the 1,400 Catholic convicts were at once delivered from the frightful temptations to hypocrisy, if not to apostasy, to which they were exposed by the periodical visits of the Protestant minister; and the reproach was removed, as far as the Government without further legislation could remove it, that an English prison was a place where a Catholic received an extra punishment because he was a Catholic, and where the reformation of the criminal by means of religious instruction meant that a Catholic was, if possible, to be unsettled in his religious belief, or, at any rate, taught to add to that knowledge of crime and vice which he carried with him into prison, the further and more dangerous knowledge that his worldly interests would be served by denying outwardly that religion which in his heart he believed to be the only means of his salvation.

But, important as this step was, there were still the two or

three thousand Catholics in the borough and county gaols, the hardship of whose spiritual lot nothing had as yet been done to relieve. The session was not allowed to pass away without an effort being made in their behalf. A Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Pope Hennessy, to provide for the appointment of Catholic chaplains to all those prisons where the number of Catholics should be such as, in the opinion of Parliament, to justify the appointment; and the Bill contained provision for the remedy of all the grievances of the Catholics in those prisons in which no such appointment was made. It is to be remembered with gratitude that the Bill bore also the name of Mr. Scholefield, the member for Birmingham.

This most valuable tentative measure was brought before the House by Mr. Pope Hennessy with the greatest prudence and discretion. Most judiciously he entered into no details, but contented himself with quoting the very strong expressions of the Prime Minister on a former occasion, which amply acknowledged the justice of the claim that Catholic prisoners should have a priest to instruct them, and not a Protestant minister. When a grievance was capable of being stated in so forcible and unanswerable a manner, it would have been a grave misfortune if the details of special hardships, a little more grievous, perhaps, than that which was universal, had been introduced into the discussion. A similar policy happily prevailed during the debate on the Prison Ministers Bill in the subsequent session. As a plain matter of fact, Mr. Whalley and Mr. Newdegate could not deny that the Catholics were placed by law when in prison under the charge of a Protestant clergyman; and they were driven to justify this anomaly by arguments which were not in the least degree calculated to prevail with the House of Commons. But if special acts of oppression, with the names and dates, had been brought forward, these gentlemen would have been relieved from this disagreeable necessity, and might have been enabled to introduce such confusion into the debate, by means of contradictions and counter-statements, that the simple point at issue—which, indeed, was so strong that it could hardly have received additional strength from a few cases of exceptional gravity—would have been in danger of being put out of sight. Let us hope that the stage at which details are necessary has now been passed in the workhouse question also. It was absolutely requisite that such details should be given, in order that attention might be secured, and a grievance be admitted to exist; but enough of this laborious work has been accomplished, and we trust that it will only be necessary to say to the Legislature that the Catholic paupers are still labouring

under the very disability from which the Catholic prisoners have been relieved—and that the children of Catholics are now, in very large numbers, being educated as Protestants—in order to obtain the concessions which justice demands. In many men's minds a case is supposed to have broken down when a single allegation, out of however large a number which have been clearly substantiated, may have been shown to be inaccurate. We trust, however, that Messrs. Whalley and Newdegate may have no such logical triumphs awaiting them, but that we may have the satisfaction once more of hearing them justify the existence of enormous grievances which they cannot deny, by a process of reasoning which does not approve itself to the understanding of any member of Parliament besides themselves.

On the question of the second reading of Mr. Pope Hennessy's Bill a debate took place, and the Bill was then withdrawn without a division. The Government amply acknowledged the existence of the evil and the necessity for a remedy, but they demurred to the provisions of the Bill then before the House. A measure proposed by Catholics themselves could not contain less than all that we conceived we were in fairness justified in asking—in other words, such an absolute equality with our Protestant fellow-subjects as happily, in these matters at least, prevails in Ireland. If we had asked for less, it would one day have been thrown in the teeth of whoever might again bring forward our claims, that the character of our demands was changing, and that on previous occasions Catholics had tacitly waived such pretensions. But though we could not ask less than we could claim as a right, we could accept less, without any sacrifice of principle. It was a disadvantage, necessarily attaching to a measure advanced by Catholics themselves, that it must contain provisions which in the present temper of the country might be dangerous, if not fatal, to its acceptance. Few, indeed, were so sanguine as to hope that, especially at so late a period of the session, Mr. Pope Hennessy's Bill would pass into law; but that it did us almost inestimable service, no one can now doubt, and, perhaps, not the least among its benefits is that it has shown us the value of a frank and fearless exposure of a grievance and of a boldly urged claim for an adequate remedy.

The immediate fruit of Mr. Pope Hennessy's tactics was an engagement on the part of the Government that before another session of Parliament the matter should receive their full consideration. We were justified in hoping that the result of this consideration would be favourable. The Ministry had, as we

have seen, fully admitted the principle, for it was impossible to deny that what was a just and reasonable regulation for the spiritual welfare of a convict was also just and reasonable for the prisoner in a borough or county gaol. The difficulty, however, lay in this, that any just and fair arrangement must, in some cases at least, involve expense; and while a Parliamentary vote for the convict prisons was chargeable on the Consolidated Fund, any additional expense in the borough or county gaols must be defrayed out of the county and borough rates; and it was well known that the greatest jealousy prevailed amongst influential members of Parliament, as amongst country gentlemen at large, of any increased charge upon the rates. This was the difficulty with which the Government had to contend, besides that resulting from the bigotry entertained by individual members of Parliament, or, what was as bad, the bigotry they were obliged to assume, in consequence of the pressure put upon them by their constituents. They could reckon almost for certain that they would meet with no party opposition from their political opponents, for it was while Lord Derby was Premier that General Peel gave the Catholic soldiers their military chaplains.

The deliberations of the Government resulted in the Prison Ministers Bill; and the difficulty with respect to the county and borough rates was met by making the Bill permissive only, and not compulsory. Whether any opposition was disarmed by this concession is doubtful. The Bill was all along argued against as if it were for a grant of public money to the Catholic priesthood, while, in reality, it was only for a permission to others to grant that money, and we must wait before we can know to what extent the permission will be used. On the other hand, it is certain that the merely permissive character of the Bill was the cause of a good deal of the opposition it encountered. Colonel Barttelot, the Earl of Chichester, and other opponents of the Bill in Parliament, and many of the petitions presented against it, dwelt on the probability of religious discussions being introduced among visiting justices and in quarter sessions; and it was probably owing to something of this feeling that Sir William Jolliffe in the Commons, and Lord Lyveden in the Lords, proposed to make the Bill compulsory whenever there were twenty Catholic inmates of a gaol. It is true that it is well these amendments were not carried, if in that event the Bill would have contained no provision at all for those cases where the Catholics in prison were fewer than that number; but it is to be regretted that the Government did not make the provisions of the Bill which relate to the intercourse between the priest and the

prisoner compulsory, even though the granting of a salary were left permissive. However, the unfailing answer of all visiting justices, when determined to hamper the action of the priest, to every request for any facilities to enable him to visit the Catholic inmates or to instruct them efficiently, always was, We cannot go beyond the Act of Parliament, which requires a *special request* on the part of the prisoner; and *this*, thanks to the Prison Ministers Act, they can say no longer, for it has been passed on purpose to enable them to be just.

The only compulsory provision in the Bill was that a register of the religion of each prisoner should be kept in every gaol. It also provided that the book in which the creed of the prisoners was recorded, should be open to the inspection of the minister who might be appointed to visit prisoners who were not members of the Established Church; but, as the Bill did not order any such appointment to be made, it did not give any priest in the kingdom the right to inspect the religious register of any prison without the authority of the visiting justices. In its passage through Parliament the wording of this provision was changed, so that no minister should have a right to see the book itself; but it was ordered that a list of the prisoners professing his religion was to be furnished to the minister appointed by the justices.

The Bill, besides permitting the appointment of what the marginal note calls "additional ministers" in all prisons "where the number of prisoners . . . belonging to some church or religious persuasion differing, if in England, from the Church of England, and if in Scotland, from the Church of Scotland, is so great as, in the opinion of the . . . persons having the appointment of chaplain in the said prison, to require the ministrations of a minister of their own church or persuasion," proposed that "they may, if they think fit, award to him a reasonable sum as a recompense for his services;" and, "if no appointment of such a minister has been made under this Act," it empowered the authorities, "*without a special request* being made by any prisoner of a church or religious persuasion differing from that of the Established Church," to "allow a minister of the church or religious persuasion to which such prisoner belongs, to visit such prisoner at proper and reasonable times, under such restrictions, imposed by them, as may guard against the introduction of improper persons, and may prevent improper communications." Lastly, the Bill proposed to repeal "so much of 4 Geo. IV., c. lxiv., s. 30, as provides 'that the chaplain shall frequently visit every room and cell in the prison occupied by prisoners, and shall direct such books to be distributed and read, and such lessons to be taught, in

such prison, as he may deem proper for the religious and moral instruction of the prisoners therein, and that he shall visit those who are in solitary confinement ;” as far as it bears on “any prisoner who is visited or attended by a minister of a church or persuasion differing from the Church of England.”

Such was the “Bill for the Amendment of the Law relating to the Religious Instruction of Prisoners in County and Borough Prisons in England and Scotland,” which the Government obtained leave to introduce without a division the 17th February, 1863. A considerable time was allowed to elapse before it was advanced a further stage, in order that no one might have a right to complain that he had been taken by surprise, or that the measure had been unduly hurried through Parliament. On the 20th of April Sir George Grey proposed its second reading in a statesman-like speech, in which he placed in a clear light the inconsistencies of the existing law. He said that it was “not surprising that the labouring classes of the population should furnish the great bulk of our criminal population and of the inmates of our gaols ;” and as, owing to the great facility of intercourse which of late has sprung up between Ireland and Great Britain, and the higher rate of remuneration for manual labour that could be obtained in this country, a large influx of Irish Roman Catholic labourers had taken place, it was “not a matter of surprise that there should be found among the prisoners a large number of Roman Catholics.” He showed that the State provided a share of the Parliamentary grant for the education of the children of Roman Catholics of the working classes ; and he described the provision made for Catholic soldiers by the appointment of priests as commissioned military chaplains. He then explained in the following happy and forcible manner how, by the present partial provision made for his spiritual necessities, a Catholic soldier who had committed some offence that entailed imprisonment might, in a military prison, be entrusted by the State to the care of a priest ; but if he were confined in a civil prison, the law would place him under the charge of a Protestant clergyman.

The soldier when he enlists finds his religious wants provided for by the State, and I am happy to say no objection is ever made to that particular vote in the War Estimates. But what is the case if he commits an offence which results in a sentence of imprisonment ? If he commits a military offence he is tried by court-martial, and if there be a military prison in the district which is not full he is sent there to undergo his punishment. In these prisons, if within reach of a commissioned chaplain, it is part of his duty to

give his attendance in them ; but when the prison is too remote from a commissioned chaplain, then special provision is made for the services of a local priest to minister to the spiritual necessities of the prisoner. But supposing there is no military prison near, or that it is full, then the Roman Catholic soldier is sent to undergo his sentence in the borough or county gaol. Or let us take the more common case, that the offence committed is against the ordinary law of the country, the offender is at once given up to the civil power, and after conviction is sent to the civil prison. What is the consequence of this accident, for such it is ? Here we come to what seems to me to be a defect in the law, for which a remedy should be found. In all county prisons it is required that a chaplain of the Established Church should be appointed, who is paid in proportion to the number of prisoners which the gaol is capable of receiving. Upon that chaplain, not by regulation, but by law, are imposed certain duties. He is bound not merely to read the services of the Church, but to visit every room and cell in which prisoners are confined, irrespective of their creed ; and to him is committed the responsibility, or the right, or the duty, whichever it may be called, of prescribing the lessons which are to be taught, and the books which are to be read by the prisoners for their moral and religious instruction. Roman Catholic prisoners equally with Protestants, subject only to one modification, are committed to the care of the Protestant chaplain. There is a modification, I allow. It is contained in what is called the "special request clause," by which, at the special request of any prisoner who is not a member of the Established Church, he may be visited by a minister of his own Church. Let the House bear in mind that, although the request be made and complied with, it in no degree modifies the obligation cast by law upon the Protestant chaplain to visit every room and cell in the prison, and to prescribe the lessons and books to be used by all the prisoners. In one case only is that law relaxed, and that is in regard to persons under sentence of death. In those cases, out of regard, I presume, to the highest interests of persons standing on the verge of eternity, it is provided that where the person so condemned is not a member of the Established Church, at his special request he may be attended by a minister of his own faith, to whose exclusive care he shall be left. I think the contrast between what is done for a Roman Catholic soldier in a military prison with what occurs to him in a civil gaol, shows that the law is defective.

Sir George then pointed out that the result of requiring by law that the prisoner should take the initiative and ask for the priest, was, that practically very few Catholics in prison ever saw the priest at all.

"I know," he said, "that some of my hon. friends allege that the very infrequency of these special requests argues a preference for Protestant teaching on the part of prisoners, and that if permission to visit is given to Roman Catholic priests, it will be an interference with the religious freedom of those prisoners. I must say that this seems to me to be an extraordinary argument. I believe that the infrequency of these requests arises not from the

preference of prisoners for one form of religion or another, but from an aversion or indifference to any religious instruction whatever; and if they were visited by Protestant chaplains, only when they made a special request to that effect, I believe the result would be just the same."

He then adverted to "what has been done in Ireland;" where "in every gaol there is a paid Protestant chaplain, although in some of those gaols there is not a single Protestant prisoner; where ample provision is also made, where there are Presbyterian prisoners, for the regular attendance, secured by payment, of a Presbyterian chaplain;" and where also, "in every county and borough prison, there is a paid Catholic priest to minister to the wants of Catholic prisoners." Such were the arguments used by the Home Secretary, in which the truth was as fairly stated as we could have stated it for ourselves, and which would indeed have served as justification of a more peremptory and absolute remedy for that which he styled "a substantial grievance."

If this had been a debate of temporary interest only, if the grievance here under discussion were an isolated one, and if that grievance had been adequately remedied, it would have been quite unnecessary for us to recur to it, except to express our gratitude to those who had taken our part. But it must not be forgotten that the Catholic paupers are still waiting, as they have so long patiently waited, for relief; and that it still rests with magistrates all over the country whether the Act which has just passed is to be a dead letter or no. It must not be forgotten that petitions against the Bill were presented by a large number of the very persons to whose judgment it is left to decide whether its passing shall be any practical deliverance from a great injustice, including, unfortunately no less than unexpectedly, bodies as important and influential as the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London, and the Middlesex magistrates. To them, rather than to the House of Commons, the arguments there urged were really addressed; for the Legislature has chosen in this matter to call upon them to share its responsibilities. Consequently the arguments that were used by the most distinguished statesmen of the country possess an interest that is more than transient; and for this reason we regard them as deserving of a record more permanent than the columns of a newspaper and more accessible than "*Hansard's Debates*." We reproduce only those portions of the discussion that bear this character, and we thus not only pass over the weak and spiritless speeches made against the Bill—so weak, indeed, that the most prejudiced could hardly fail to acknowledge, for once, on which side truth and justice lay—but we

also leave unquoted Colonel Wilson Patten's recognition of the grievance, and Lord Edward Howard's detailed account of the results of his own investigation of the subject. The one only argument that the opponents of the Bill could find to urge that had even a semblance of reason, was that "a special request" to see a prisoner was never refused. Mr. Henley answered it thus :—

The strongest argument used against the appointment of these chaplains was, that prisoners themselves might not want them ; but he imagined that if it were left to the prisoners belonging to the Established Church to say whether they would have the visitation of their chaplains, they would take off their hats and say, "We would rather be excused, and if you would give us a little beer we would like it much better." Again, it was urged that the only parties who asked for the appointment of these chaplains were the fellow-countrymen of Roman Catholic prisoners outside the gaol. But surely the persons who were anxious to promote the reformation of prisoners were not the persons who were in gaols themselves, but benevolent and philanthropic people outside of them, who wished that criminals during their incarceration should be taught to lead a better life when they were released, and who thought it best not to trust altogether to the deterring effect of the gibbet, the lash, and other agencies of that kind.

Mr. Baines showed how the measure looked from the point of view at which an impartial Nonconformist regarded it, who, though the terms of the Bill were general, saw, as all others did, that only Catholics required it, when he said, that—

Strongly attached as he was to the Protestant religion and to the voluntary principle in education and in religion, he found it quite impossible to deny the justice of this measure. He thought the Bill ought to be supported on two plain grounds : first, that it was the duty and interest of the State to see that prisoners under confinement should receive moral and religious instruction ; and, secondly, that justice required of the public to afford them that instruction. Prisoners could not go and seek religious instruction ; it must be provided for them ; and it would be a mockery to offer the religious instruction of a Protestant chaplain to a Roman Catholic prisoner. On a full consideration of the question, he felt it his duty to vote for the second reading.

Mr. Disraeli spoke at considerable length on the allegation that the Bill would affect the Protestantism of the country, or would endow the Catholic priesthood. He then argued most forcibly that the whole tendency of modern legislation was in one direction, and that to oppose the Bill was simply an anachronism. We subjoin two valuable passages from his speech.

As my right hon. friend the member for Oxfordshire said, it is a Bill to do an act of justice. It is said that the Roman Catholic prisoner has never required the assistance which this Bill proposes to extend to him, but the objections which have been raised to it on that ground appear to me to be founded on a complete fallacy. This is a Bill to do justice, not merely to the Roman Catholic prisoner, but to the Protestant community. On what possible ground, after having adopted those principles with regard to the treatment of criminals which have been confirmed by a long series of legislation, can you justify that legislation to Protestant England if you say that there shall be in the gaols of the country a considerable portion of the penal population whom you will take no care to reform, and whom you are prepared periodically to let loose again on the country, unreformed by the influences of religion? It is a measure in harmony with all the legislation which this House of late years has sanctioned on these subjects. I am told that it introduces a new and dangerous principle. Where, I ask, is the new principle? The principle is one which has been long acknowledged, and which has for several years been acted upon. If the status of the Church of England be imperilled by the presence of Roman Catholic chaplains in a gaol, surely it will be equally imperilled by their presence in a regiment? If the presence of a Roman Catholic chaplain in an English gaol be dangerous, surely it is equally dangerous in an Irish gaol? It is too late to take such high ground. The speech of the hon. member who moved this amendment was an excellent speech for the time before Catholic Emancipation or the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, but it will not do now. In my opinion, the strength of the Church of England does not depend upon devices of that kind, but on deeper grounds and on principles which are of a much more enduring nature. The privileges of the Church of England represent popular rights, and so long as they represent popular rights, national sympathy will always rally round that great institution. The power of the Church of England and the Protestant feeling of the country will not be supported and maintained by a course of action inconsistent with all our previous legislation, which by placing obstacles in the way of that great scheme for ameliorating the character and condition of our criminal population, will prevent its entire fulfilment, and must thus produce consequences injurious to society at large.

The debate was excellently closed by Lord Palmerston, who has on all occasions spoken on behalf of the Catholic prisoner in the same manly and honest tone.

I think it is a question, not between Protestants and Catholics, but between sound sense and most respectable and honourable prejudice. There are no prejudices which are more lasting in men's minds than those founded on the perversion of honourable and reasonable opinions. The perversion of the best is often productive of the worst results. I was in hopes that all prejudices on these matters had been dispelled some thirty-four years ago, when this House resolved, after the longest deliberation, and in consequence of discussion lasting for years, that the distinction of religious opinions

should make no distinction in civil, political, or social condition. Parliament, when it repealed the penal laws, affirmed substantially the principle that no danger was to be apprehended to the Protestant faith from the intercourse of Catholic priests with any part of the community. We have affirmed the principle that there is no danger to the Protestant religion in the access of Roman Catholic priests to those who in this and the other House of Parliament are entrusted with the duty of voting on matters which most deeply affect the welfare of the nation. We see no danger to the Protestant Church from a Catholic priest having intercourse with officers and soldiers who bear arms in the service of the country, and on whom the destinies of the nation may depend. Are we, then, to be called on to say that there will be danger to the Protestant Church and the Protestant religion if a Roman Catholic priest have access, not to men within these walls, or who bear arms in the service of the country, but to men confined in a prison suffering for their crimes, and whom it is the duty of the State, if possible, to reform? To reject this measure would be to act in opposition to everything which has been the foundation of the policy of this country for the last thirty-four years. It has been well argued that it would be a reversal of the policy which has been pursued in regard to the improvement of the condition of the criminal population. There is nothing which has more occupied the attention of men than the means of reforming the criminal during the period of his confinement. And are Catholic prisoners to be less the objects of our attention than Protestant? Or is it that you consider the Catholic so hopeless a criminal that nothing can redeem him, and therefore you would let him go out of prison in the same moral condition as he entered it? That is not the opinion of men who have devoted themselves to the moral improvement of the criminal. But then, it is argued, he can have the advice of the Protestant clergyman. But will any man who knows anything of human nature tell me that the advice of the Protestant clergyman would be as effective as that of the minister of his own religion? What are his earliest impressions? He may forget the precepts of good, but he will not forget the impressions instilled into his mind when he was told that there was something in the Protestant religion which he should avoid as inconsistent with his salvation. Well, that impression will remain when the Protestant clergyman comes to give him spiritual advice. Give him, then, the benefit of having advice and consolation from a man who approaches him with all the advantages derived from early association. But, then, I am told there are complaints. Yes; but complaints which are founded on facts are more powerful than complaints which are founded on prejudice. We know there are a great many Catholic prisoners who cannot have access to ministers of their own religion. We are told they do not ask for them. Yes; but the man who wants religious instruction most is the very man least likely to ask for it. The very fact that he does not ask for it is the most conclusive proof that he stands in need of it. You might as well say that an ignorant boy at school does not ask for a lesson. Why, the more he stood in need of instruction, the more he would like to go to play and avoid his lessons. So it is with the criminal, the more he needs instruction the less likely is he to ask for it; and the religious instruction which he would receive from a minister of his own faith is that which is

most likely to go to his heart, to improve his mind, and to send him out of prison a better man than he was before. There is something, I think, ungenerous in endeavouring to take advantage of the compulsory seclusion of a criminal in order to sap the faith in which he was born. I am for all being Protestants, and if it were possible to conceive such a thing that every Roman Catholic in the United Kingdom should rise up to-morrow a Protestant, I should say that it would be a blessed thing for the country. But don't let us attempt making proselytes by taking advantage of the seclusion of criminals in a prison to which they have been consigned as well for improvement as for punishment. I hope, then, the House will not go back, as I think they would do by assenting to the rejection of this Bill, from that course of policy which we have so long pursued; but that hon. members will feel that, so far from the Bill being a danger, it will be a source of strength to the Church of England, by removing a subject of obloquy and reproach.

The Bill was probably never in real danger, as the leaders of both parties had pronounced so strongly in its favour, although no less than 176 members assembled to record their names against it, either by voting or pairing; but neither the majority nor the minority seemed to be inclined to listen to an anti-Catholic tirade from Mr. Whalley. Any one who is unacquainted with the licence that members of the first deliberative assembly in the world allow themselves, would find it impossible to form an adequate idea of the noise that filled the House during the twenty minutes that he spent in delivering an inaudible speech. The reporter of the *Times* truly described the clamour as "distinct from the ordinary chorus of impatience and the irritating cry of 'divide-vide-vide-vide';—it rose and fell in irregular cadences, one of these resembling the moaning of the wind through a ship's cordage." This was the prelude to the division, by which the second reading of the Bill was carried by a majority of thirty, in a House, including pairs, of 382 members.

The *Times*, the next morning, remarked that "the division was close enough to show how little real zeal there is for consistency or fairness, or even the improvement of criminals, when the least glimpse of a great horror has once invaded the soul." The truth, however, probably was, that many of the members who abstained from voting, and many, perhaps, who voted against us, had the fear of their constituencies before their eyes. From them it is a pleasure to turn to acknowledge the thanks that we owe to the 206 members who risked their popularity for the sake of justice.

To the names of party leaders in the Commons to whom our thanks are due, we must add that of the Earl of Derby, to whose advocacy of our cause in the House of Lords we assur-

edly owe it that the Bill passed through the Upper House. He said, in the debate of the 8th of June,—

So highly do I value the principle of unity of action, that if this were a matter of minor importance or a question on which I felt a shadow of a doubt, I should infinitely prefer to waive my own opinions, and to give way to objections and scruples the force of which I did not myself feel. But I do not look upon this as a matter of minor importance. My opinion of the policy and justice of this measure is so clear and so decided that, painful as it is for me to differ from my noble friend, I cannot refrain from giving that vote which I believe I am called to give by justice. . . . My noble friend says that the present law does all that is necessary ; but I differ from him there altogether. I do not think that the provisions of the law as it stands are satisfactory, or founded on justice. Whatever may be the provisions of the law at the present time, it is perfectly clear that this injustice is so great that in many of our principal prisons they are to a great extent departed from. The law is that every prisoner shall be visited by the chaplain of the gaol, who of course is a minister of the Church of England. I know the perfect honesty and conscientiousness of my noble friend, and I will ask him one question. If this were a Roman Catholic country, containing a considerable number of Protestant prisoners, and if they were compelled to receive, whether they would or not, the visits of Roman Catholic priests, so that the whole period of their confinement was not only a penal sentence, not an attempt at reformation alone, but one continued system of proselytism, would he consider the provisions of such a law satisfactory ? My noble friend says that this restriction does not apply to the case of prisoners who desire to see a minister of their own persuasion. The law says that the chaplain shall be a clergyman of the Church of England ; it is the good sense of the magistrates which says to the prisoners, "If you desire to see a minister of your own persuasion we will take upon ourselves to supersede the law and allow you to see him." But is it reasonable to argue from the supposition that men of the character and the past lives of the majority of our prisoners will readily come forward and ask for the services of a minister of their own religion ? A very considerable number of the Roman Catholic prisoners have asked for the services of their own clergy ; and it is greatly to the credit of the Roman Catholic clergy that in no case have they neglected the call made upon them. With regard to Protestant dissenters there have been no such demands, and for very sufficient reasons. There are no such broad distinctions between the different sects of Protestant Dissenters as to prevent the members of one receiving religious consolation and instruction from the ministers of the other ; and Dissenting ministers would not object to prisoners of their persuasion receiving the ministrations of the Church of England chaplain. The case of Roman Catholics, however, is widely different. They are instructed that to listen to the teachings of a minister not of their own persuasion is a heinous sin. A prisoner of no particular strength of religious feeling would not object to listen to the chaplain of the Church of England, because he does not consider his teaching to be of any authority whatever ; but he will most earnestly deprecate being visited

by a priest of his own faith, who has more power over his mind, and to whom he will attribute a great deal more authority and responsibility than he would to the minister of any other persuasion. We have been led to believe that reformation is the great object of punishment. I am afraid it does not follow as frequently as philanthropists would wish, but undoubtedly it is one of the objects of punishment, and one of the agencies which we must use in bringing it about is that of religious instruction and consolation. . . . Although the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church may be mingled with much of error, I cannot deny that the influence of the priests of that Church must have a most powerful tendency to guide the minds of prisoners of their own persuasion and to awaken those prisoners to a sense of their former life. Either it is desirable that Roman Catholic prisoners should have that teaching, or it is not. If it is desirable, we are bound to give it to them in order to accomplish the main object of punishment—namely, the reformation of offenders. They will not accept your teaching; they are not desirous of it; and it is not your duty to force it on them. But it is your duty to let them have religious instruction which they will attend to. My noble friend does not dispute that in some cases this instruction is now given, and rightly given. The only point in dispute is whether it should be given gratuitously or should be paid for. My noble friend does not dispute the propriety of allowing Roman Catholic clergymen to give instruction in prisons; but he contends that they should do so on their own responsibility and at their own expense. It is quite true that there are prisons in which there are very few Roman Catholic prisoners; and in these it is never impossible and seldom difficult to procure the attendance of a Roman Catholic clergyman; but there are many prisons in which it would be unjust and impossible to call on the Roman Catholic clergyman to give his services without any remuneration, if it be desirable that the prisoners of his religious persuasion should have the advantage of these services. I belong to a county in the gaols of which there is the greatest number of Roman Catholic prisoners, while my noble friend belongs to one in the gaol of which there is perhaps the smallest number. This may account for our taking different views on the subject. I find that in the borough gaol of Liverpool there are about 350 or 360 prisoners who are members of the Church of England. The Protestant chaplain of that prison receives a sum of £400 a year for his services. In the same gaol there are 460 Roman Catholic prisoners. The Roman Catholic priest attends twice a week, and the remuneration for his services to about 100 more prisoners than are attended by the Protestant chaplain is just *nil* as against the £400 paid to the latter gentleman. My lords, it is impossible to look at those returns and to argue in the face of the facts which they disclose that you are dealing justly and equitably as between the ministers of the two religions. Why does not my noble friend object to the system which exists in Ireland, and under which there is compulsory payment out of the county rates of the Roman Catholic chaplains employed in the gaols of that country. If it would be a mortal sin to do this in England, we are sinning deeply in Ireland, because there the law not only gives you the opportunity, but compels you to do it. Certainly, among my noble friends coming from the north

of Ireland, who are most strongly opposed to the Roman Catholic religion, I have never heard any objection raised to the payment out of the county rates of the Roman Catholic chaplains in the gaols there. I think it of no small importance that the magistrates should have the appointment. I think it of importance that the priest should feel that he is appointed by the magistrates, subject to their jurisdiction, and responsible to them for the performance of his duty. My noble friend apprehends that this provision may be overridden, and that while nominally in the hands of the magistrates the appointment of the priest may in reality be in the hands of the Roman Catholic bishop, and my noble friend referred to a case in which he says Archbishop Cullen insisted on a particular appointment and in which the Irish Poor Law Commissioners—as I think very unwisely—yielded; but I feel persuaded that there is not much fear of magistrates in this country allowing themselves to be browbeaten and bullied by an imprudent Roman Catholic bishop. I am sure they would maintain their authority if any attempt were made to set it at defiance. No doubt there are imprudent and ill-judging bishops in the Roman Catholic Church, as I am afraid there are in all other churches; but, though the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church may be that the Church and bishops are superior to the law, that happily is not a doctrine which prevails in this country, and magistrates would take care to let their authority be felt, and to show that no man was superior to the law. It is true that the Roman Catholic bishop might prohibit the clergyman from acting, but in that case the deprivation of religious instruction would lie, not at the magistrate's, but at the bishop's door. I think that consideration will weigh with Roman Catholic bishops in this country, and I am not apprehensive that any result of this kind will ensue. It appears to me that the Bill is one which meets the justice and the equity of the case, and does not go beyond it.

In the Lords, the majority, on the second reading, of 35, was proportionally much larger than that of the Commons; the Contents being 65, and the Non-contents 30.

As it is by the divisions on the second reading that the principle of a Bill is affirmed or rejected, it will not be necessary for us to make any reference to the debates in either House on other stages, further than to remark that when in the Commons it was proposed by Mr. Packe that all provision for payment of priests should be omitted from the Bill, the majority in favour of the measure as it stood was larger than on any other division, excepting when Sir Andrew Agnew proposed to omit the third clause altogether. In the one case the majority was 66, and in the other 99. The various changes that were introduced into the Bill in its passage through the committees of either House may be best judged of by a view of the whole as it now stands in the Act when it received the Royal Assent.

But before we turn to this, which will be the conclusion, or all but the conclusion of our present task, we must revert for

a moment to the assistance we received from a very able, but not less unexpected, ally. When the *Times* wishes to be fair, it can be very fair, and such fairness is all the more acceptable from its rarity. Such articles as that with which it introduced to indignant Englishmen the conduct of Lord Chief Justice Campbell in the famous Achilli trial, must count for a great deal in our estimate of the great journal; and with regard to the religious treatment of Catholic prisoners, it preferred to follow the most distinguished statesmen of both political parties rather than try to earn for itself a little popularity by raising a "No Popery" cry. Such, to their honour be it spoken, was the course pursued by all the English newspapers that are not professedly the organs of anti-Catholic bigotry. But the *Times* so seldom brings the unquestionable ability of its writers to our assistance, that we venture to make some copious extracts from one of the two leading articles that it has given on the Prison Ministers Bill; and we do so with the less misgiving respecting our readers' patience, as we know that no words of ours can have half the effect with those on whom the fate of our poor prisoners depends, that the arguments and the tone of the *Times* are sure to have. On the 21st of April it thus spoke of us, inspired by the debate of the night before, and even looking forward to an equal claim of justice being shortly advanced in behalf of Catholic paupers. Is it to this that we owe the speech made against us by the Bishop of London in the subsequent debate in the House of Lords?

In the abstract, and in the simple and natural view of the case, the 3,000 Roman Catholics in our prisons, and the 1,500 in our convict establishments, require spiritual care quite as much as their Protestant fellow criminals, and are too considerable a body to be passed over. We are bound to do for the Roman Catholics just what we do for the Protestants, not leaving it to their choice whether they will receive pastoral visits or not, but sending the chaplain to them, and leaving upon their own heads the responsibility of rejecting him. So long as we confine our attention to the poor wretch absolutely in our grasp, and shut up body and soul from all other influences, we cannot dispute that we must get at his conscience as best we may. Every consideration of humanity and religion brings us to this point. We pride ourselves on the care we take of the prisoner. We keep him warm, sweet, and dry; we sustain his spirits with plenty of wholesome food; we give him moderate work to exercise and amuse him; we cheer him with the hope of release before his time, and flatter ourselves that we send him out a wiser, and better, and stronger, and happier man. We then compare our prisons with those which Howard visited, and which the old Bourbons kept up wherever they reigned. The real difference is that our prisons sustain life, and those prisons were only the plausible means of a more cruel death than that of the

scaffold. But we cannot do all this without going a step further. As we take the body under our care, so have we taken the soul—the soul of the Papist as well as the soul of the Protestant. This duty, too, we must discharge on our own established and now national principles of religious toleration and equality.

It is the fact of our having the entire charge of these poor creatures that leaves us really little choice in this question. No doubt that charge is troublesome and disagreeable. It is much easier and cheaper to shoot, to hang, or to starve criminals, or to let them rot and forget them. Not only is it easier, but in some places you must either destroy the class, or be destroyed by them. We, on the contrary, are undoubted masters, and can do what we please with the criminal, only at a rather inconvenient cost and trouble. Such responsibility cannot be discharged without doing all we can for the souls whose ill-conditioned state has brought them to this pass. The very utmost that could be said in reply to these plain considerations last night was that prisoners might have the priest if they wished. This is as much as to say that the responsibility of spiritual correction and improvement rests on the prisoner, not on the authority which has put him in prison. Yet we do not leave Protestant prisoners to choose for themselves. We send them the chaplain whether they wish it or no. Soldiers are under our care, and, accordingly, we give them Roman Catholic and Presbyterian as well as Church of England chaplains. Being free, they can demand chaplains of their own persuasion. The only reason upon which we could refuse to prisoners what we grant to soldiers is that they are not free, and are therefore at our mercy. But that is a plea which the nation cannot entertain for a day. We must do our best with these poor creatures. Nobody pretends that they are best left alone, or that the Church of England chaplain will have much chance with them, or that it is even fair to give him either the monopoly of access or the practical advantage arising from being the authorized and paid official. As a general rule, nothing is well done that is not paid for. The most zealous priest will flag before long if his services are not acknowledged as services usually are. He may be glad to see this prisoner or that, if he can take his choice; but he will not undertake all the Roman Catholics in a prison, with all the variations of character and condition certain to be found in it. So, if the work is to be really done, it must not be left to an unpaid amateur, doing what he pleases because he pleases to do it.

We have not undertaken the spiritual care of the Roman Catholic out of doors, for we have not taken him in hand at all. The prisoner we have taken in hand, and we are therefore answerable for his spiritual care. But will not the precedent lead further? That is a question which it is needless to answer, for it is impossible to do a generous act, or even an act of justice, without being immediately called on to do a good deal more of the same kind. The world, disgusted and despairing of good, looks about for some one better than the common herd, and when it finds him engaged in some good act immediately besets him with petitions for more. So it is only too probable that what we do for a few hundred prisoners we shall have to do for others. But it is no business of ours to put claims in the order of precedence, and tell people what else they may rightly ask when one thing is given. For the

matter now in hand, magistrates will not be very lavish with the funds at their disposal, and will take care that the priest performs his office strictly with a view to the good of the prisoner's soul, and those poor amends which the worst man may make by a full public confession.

We now pass from the Bill to the Act; from the measure as proposed by the Government, to the statute that is now part of the law of England. Its title we have prefixed to this article. Its preamble states that "it is expedient to amend the law relating to prisons in England and Scotland, with respect to the religious instruction of the prisoners confined therein." The first clause gives it the short title of "The Prison Ministers Act, 1863." The second declares the Act to apply "in *England* to all gaols, prisons, and houses of correction (hereinafter included under the term 'prisons') that are maintained at the expense of any county, riding, division, or liberty of a county, or of any county of a city, county of a town or borough; and in *Scotland* to all local prisons as defined by 'The Prisons (*Scotland*) Administration Act, 1860.'"

We subjoin *verbatim* the remaining clauses of the Act:—

3. Where the number of prisoners confined in any prison to which this Act applies, and belonging to some Church or religious persuasion differing, if in England, from the Church of England, and if in Scotland, from the Church of Scotland, is so great as, in the opinion of the justices, county board, or other persons having the appointment of chaplain in the said prison, to require the ministrations of a minister of their own Church or persuasion, the said justices, county board, or other persons may appoint a minister of such last-mentioned Church or persuasion to attend at the said prison on the prisoners of his own Church or persuasion, and they may, if they think fit, award to him a reasonable sum as a recompense for his services, such sum to be deemed a part of the expenses of the prison to which he is appointed, and to be paid out of the funds legally applicable to the payment of such expenses.

The visiting justices of any prison may, if they think fit, without a special request being made by, but not against the will of, any prisoner of a Church or religious persuasion differing from that of the Established Church, permit a minister of the Church or persuasion to which such prisoner belongs (if no appointment of such a minister has been made under this Act) to visit such prisoner at proper and reasonable times, under such restrictions imposed by them as may guard against the introduction of improper persons, and may prevent improper communications; provided that any prisoner shall, on request, be allowed, subject to the rules of the gaol, to attend the chapel, or to be visited by the chaplain of the gaol. Every minister appointed or permitted to visit prisoners under this Act shall hold his appointment or permission to visit during the pleasure of the authority by whom he was appointed or permitted to visit, and shall conform in all respects to the regu-

lations of the prison at which he attends. No minister shall be appointed under this Act for any prison in which there is not a chaplain of the Established Church.

4. The keeper or other person performing the duties of keeper of a prison on receiving into his custody any prisoner shall enter his name in a book to be provided for the purpose, with the addition of the Church or religious persuasion to which the prisoner shall declare himself to belong, and the said keeper or other person shall from time to time give to any minister appointed or permitted to visit prisoners in the prison a list of the prisoners so declared to belong to the Church or persuasion of such minister, and no such minister shall be permitted to attend or visit any prisoner belonging to any religious persuasion differing from that to which such minister belongs.

5. So much of the Thirtieth Section of the said Act passed in the fourth year of His late Majesty King George the Fourth, chapter sixty-four, as provides "that the chaplain shall frequently visit every room and cell in the prison occupied by prisoners, and shall direct such books to be distributed and read, and such lessons to be taught, in such prison, as he may deem proper for the religious and moral instruction of the prisoners therein, and that he shall visit those who are in solitary confinement," shall not apply to any prisoner who is attended or visited by a minister of a Church or persuasion differing from the Church of England, except when the visits of any such minister shall have been discontinued for the period of fourteen days; and no prisoner belonging to any Church or religious persuasion shall be compelled to attend any religious service held or performed by any chaplain, minister, or religious instructor of a Church or religious persuasion to which the said prisoner does not belong.

The third clause, it will be seen, confers two different powers on the justices: (1) to appoint a priest, and pay him, or not, as they may think fit; and (2) when no priest is appointed, to permit him to visit a prisoner without any special request on the part of the prisoner.

The first portion of this clause does not seem to call for any observation, except the very obvious one that the appointment will not confer the title of chaplain, nor the position of an officer of the prison. The difference, however, between the chaplain and the "additional minister" is but nominal; it being understood that some duties, such as that of making reports, have not been imposed upon the "minister" appointed "to attend on the prisoners of his own Church." But the second portion of the clause demands further comment.

By it the necessity for a "special request" is entirely removed. The value of this as a real step in legislation is inestimable. It is an abandonment of the assumption hitherto made by the law that, *in England*, a Catholic, for whose well-being the country is responsible, must make some move beyond and besides declaring himself to be a Catholic, in

order to be provided with those religious aids and consolations which his condition disables him from providing for himself. God grant it may not be long before the Catholic pauper, whose position in this respect is precisely the parallel with that of the Catholic prisoner, shall have the same measure of fairness and justice extended to him. It is true that in the county and borough prisons the change in the law is not compulsory. It remains as before, that if a Catholic prisoner specially asks for a priest, the justices cannot refuse; but they are at liberty, if they choose, to permit a priest to see a Catholic who has not asked for him.

But first, this is accompanied by the singular proviso that it is not to be "against the will" of the prisoner. This qualification is not introduced into the former half of the clause, so that the justices can appoint a priest to visit all the Catholic prisoners, whether the prisoners wish it or no. And this is the natural arrangement. The Protestant chaplain is not only allowed, but bound, to visit all the prisoners under his care, without reference to their will or wish for his visits. This is a portion of the discipline to which the State subjects the offender for his reformation; and in it there is nothing which can be complained of as interfering with that degree of liberty which a man has a right to retain during his term of punishment, as long as he professes the religion of the chaplain who visits him. And so it is to be also with the priest who is "appointed," but not with the priest who is "permitted," to visit the Catholics. We have yet to learn in what the "appointment" is to differ from the "permission." Clearly the salary does not constitute the difference, for after the appointment is made, it remains optional with the justices to give or withhold the "reasonable sum as a recompense for the services."

But let us suppose the case of a prison where the Catholics are very few in number—too few "in the opinion of the justices to require" the appointment of a priest; it is clear that the insertion of the words, "but not against the will of any prisoner," may be productive of grave evil. In such a prison there may be a Catholic who has no idea whatever of turning Protestant, but who refuses all religious help and instruction,—what is to become of him? His not changing his religion and his continuing on the register as a Catholic, is in itself proof positive that no good can be done to him by the Protestant chaplain, as Lord Palmerston and other speakers we have quoted have most forcibly shown. He refuses, in his wilfulness, to see a priest, whose visits might bring him to a better state of mind; and the words so senselessly inserted in

the Prison Ministers Act prevent the justices from overruling his obstinacy. What will become of him, therefore, is plain. For in the fifth clause of the Act it is, in effect, provided that, if he persists in his refusal for a fortnight after the priest's last visit to him, he falls back again, for as long as his obduracy shall continue, into the charge of the Protestant chaplain; and though he may object to his visits as strongly as he objects to the visits of the priest, the clause of the Act of 4 Geo. IV., which describes the duties of the Protestant chaplain, remains unrepealed in his regard.

The second part of the third clause of the Act contains another very objectionable provision, the very same the effect of which we had feared in the fourth of the Rules for Convict Prisons, but which Sir Joshua Jebb assured us, as we have already said, should not be acted upon in the case of the convicts. The words we have to lament are these,—“Provided that any prisoner shall, on request, be allowed, subject to the rules of the gaol, to attend the chapel or to be visited by the chaplain of the gaol.” The fourth clause very properly provides that no minister, appointed or permitted to visit prisoners, “shall be permitted to attend or visit any prisoner belonging to any religious persuasion differing from that to which such minister belongs.” If it is not to be desired that the priest should be permitted to visit a Protestant prisoner, unless, of course, the man wishes to become a Catholic, exactly the same rule ought to be extended to the Protestant chaplain.

This noxious amendment is calculated only to foster hypocrisy, and to lead prisoners to conform to religious observances in which they do not believe, through human respect or for some, perhaps, imaginary advantage. Nevertheless, our gain under the Act is very great. Before it was passed, the Catholic prisoner could see the priest “on request,” and was visited by the Protestant chaplain as a matter of course; now the justices have the power of reversing all this, so that he shall be visited as a matter of course by the priest, and shall not be visited by the chaplain unless he request his attendance.

Our objection to this provision, as well as to the other respecting the will of the prisoner, is that they run counter to the rule of religious equality; that they apply to the Catholic priest and not to the Protestant chaplain. But we do not wish to see these provisions extended to the Protestants, for they are intrinsically bad. The visit of his religious instructor should in no way depend upon the prisoner's will; and the minister of another religion than that which he professes should not be allowed to visit him, even on his request, unless he wishes to change his religion. For that

case some rule has yet to be laid down. All that is necessary is that sufficient time should be provided for reflection, during which the prisoner should be kept free from influence in the direction towards which his mind appears to be tending. If a fortnight, for instance, were to be allowed from the time a request was made for a transfer from one religious register to the other, and if, during that time, the Protestant desiring to become a Catholic were to be visited only by the Protestant chaplain, or the Catholic proposing to become a Protestant by the Catholic priest, a check would be put upon such changes being made in a moment of vexation. Such a rule would naturally not apply when the request was that an incorrect registration should be amended; when, in fact, a prisoner was not really changing his religion, but only correcting a mis-statement as to his religion made by him on his entry into the prison.

The last sentence in the third clause provides that no appointment of a priest shall be made "for any prison in which there is not a chaplain of the Established Church;" but this is a matter of no consequence, as "appointments" would be made only in the larger gaols; and the "permission" to visit under this Act can be given even for prisons where there is no Protestant chaplain.

With regard to the fourth clause of the Act, we must say how strongly we hope that the admirable "Notice and Instructions concerning a Prisoner's Religion," which have been issued for the convict prisons by the Home Office, may be adopted in all the prisons in the country. It is of the greatest importance that the prisoner should be at once informed that a priest attends the prison and visits the Catholic prisoners; and if the governor will add, that nothing is to be gained by professing one religion rather than another, and that no favour is shown to any on account of their religion, all that is possible will then have been done to counteract the cowardly habit of dissembling which we fear is very common amongst the criminal inmates of prisons.

The Bill proposed, as we have before observed, to permit the priest attending the prison to have access to the religious register; but the Act does not enjoin on the keeper of the prison to furnish him from time to time with a list of the Catholic prisoners. This change, which was proposed by Mr. Henley, was made, we suppose, with the view of guarding against the priest having an opportunity of complaining of the incorrectness of the registry of prisoners recorded as Protestants. But here again it would seem that an invidious distinction is made between the Protestant chaplain and the Catholic priest.

The last clause calls for only one observation, and that is on the exception to the repeal of the statutory duties of the Protestant chaplain towards Catholics, as expressed in the words, "except when the visits of any such minister shall have been discontinued for the period of fourteen days." There are several gaols in England and Wales in which there are a few Catholic prisoners, but which gaols are at some distance from a Catholic priest. Lord Edward Howard's return gives us five Catholics in Bedford County Gaol, three in Bucks, four in Cornwall County Gaol at Bodmin, six in Huntingdon, three in the House of Correction at Kirtton, two at Falkingham, three at Spalding, two at Swaffham, eight at Southwell, two in Somerset County, fifteen at Lewes, one at Appleby, four at Beaumaris, three in Carmarthen County, one in Carnarvon, six in Denbigh County at Ruthin, four in Merioneth County at Dolgelly, and three in Montgomery County. Now all that can be done in any of these cases is that the neighbouring priest should be furnished from time to time with a list of the Catholics in prison, and that he should visit them whenever he can make it convenient to go over to the town in which the gaol is situated. If his visits are repeated once a fortnight, all will be well, and the Catholic prisoners will be exempted from all interference on the part of the Protestant chaplain. But supposing his engagements are such that he is unable to visit the prison so often as every fortnight, then the Catholic prisoners continue to form a part of the charge of the Protestant chaplain as much as the Protestant prisoners themselves. No doubt this insertion was made to provide for the case of Dissenters. Take the case of the Borough Gaol at Leeds, where there are reported to be thirty-three Methodists among the prisoners; or that of Wakefield, where there are eighty-five Wesleyans. The authorities might permit a Wesleyan minister to visit these prisoners, and he might avail himself but seldom of the permission. The result would be that, if they were entirely exempted from the charge of the Protestant chaplain, they would receive very insufficient attention. There is evidently nothing in the provisions of the Act of which Dissenters can complain; for they have no conscientious objections to the exhortations of an Established Church chaplain. But Catholics are in a very different position, and ought, for conscience' sake, to be exempted on all occasions from any spiritual relation with a Protestant clergyman.

This disadvantage has been brought upon us by the Act being made to extend to Dissenters as well as to Catholics. The Dissenters did not want it; no opposition was disarmed by extending its provisions to them, for Sir George Grey from the very beginning acknowledged that it was only for Catholics

that the Act was needed; it was argued all through as if it applied to Catholics only; and if it had been, as was Mr. Pope Hennessy's Bill, applicable to "Roman Catholic prisoners" only, we firmly believe that it would not have been difficult to pass a measure that should have had a compulsory force in the case of the larger gaols. The only objection, so far as we observed, that was made to Mr. Pope Hennessy's Bill, was that it made the appointment of the Catholic chaplain rest with the Catholic bishop. We need not say that, if we are grateful for the Prison Ministers Act, we should have accepted with pleasure an Act like that proposed by Mr. Pope Hennessy, even though the appointment of the Catholic chaplain had been vested in the civil authorities.

In one respect, the Prison Ministers Act excels Mr. Pope Hennessy's Bill, for it applies, not only to England and Wales, but to Scotland also. That this provision was most necessary may be gathered from the numbers given in Lord Edward Howard's return, from which we learn that, out of 533 Catholics only 36 had been visited by the priest during the last three months of 1861.

We have no further duty to perform in introducing the Prison Ministers Act to our readers, than to express our conviction that, in spite of all its imperfections, they may yield it a hearty welcome. Its passing will render the session of 1863 memorable to Catholics. It is the first Act of Parliament that we can look upon as the result of a dispassionate consideration of the grievances under which Catholics labour, and of an honest desire to redress them. There were many, no doubt, who voted for emancipation in the same laudable spirit; but it was the fear of an insurrection in Ireland that produced the majority that carried it. The Reformatory and Industrial School Acts were measures new for Protestants as well as Catholics; and the fairness and impartiality of the Privy Council system in the distribution of the funds voted by Parliament for the education of the poor afforded a happy precedent, which was liberally followed when the State undertook to assist reformatory and industrial institutions. Departments of the Government have remedied particular grievances, and have introduced rules, as in the army and navy, and in the convict prisons, by the fair application of which we have largely benefited. But the Prison Ministers Act is the first legislative result of a statement to Parliament of hardships to which we are subject on account of our religion. When analogous questions are brought before the Legislature, we trust that our debt of gratitude, already no light one, for the poor Catholic prisoner's sake, may be largely increased by the consistent

and efficacious advocacy of our cause—which is the cause of justice—on the part of Sir George Grey and Lord Palmerston, Mr. Disraeli and Lord Derby.

Here we should have laid aside our pen, leaving the reader to hope that in another year we may have an issue at least as satisfactory to narrate of the spiritual privations under which our Catholic paupers and their children labour, if it were not that there is one institution to which sufficient attention has not yet been drawn, and with which justice demands that Parliament should interfere. There is a large school at Feltham, called an industrial school, but in reality a reformatory, and established under a special Act of Parliament. It is under the sole management of the Middlesex magistrates. The authority of the Home Secretary does not extend to it, neither is it visited by the Inspector of Reformatories, and it is, therefore, not mentioned in his reports. In this school, we have good reason to believe, there are more than eighty Catholic boys who are being educated as Protestants. The sole recognition of any difference between a Catholic and a Protestant criminal boy is expressed in the following resolution of the visiting justices:—

Extract from the Minutes of the Committee of 11th June, 1860.

Resolved, that upon special request being made to the superintendent of the Middlesex Industrial School by any boy of a religious persuasion differing from that of the Established Church, or by the parents of such boy, that the latter should be visited by a minister of such persuasion, the request be immediately forwarded by the superintendent to such minister, who shall be allowed to visit the boy on Tuesdays and Thursdays, between ten and three o'clock; and that when any such request shall be made by a boy's parents who cannot write, their mark be made in the presence of, and witnessed by, a householder.

Now here, it is to be remarked, we have the “special request”—which Parliament has just declared shall not be required of the adult criminal—required of the juvenile criminal or his parents. Next, the class of people from whom the inmates of our reformatories generally come, have this request made more difficult for them by being obliged to find a householder to witness it, if they are themselves unable to write. Thirdly, the request must be addressed to the superintendent. A letter to a priest asking him to attend a boy in the school is not “a request” in the eyes of the Middlesex magistrates. Fourthly, no means are used to enable parents to know that, if they choose to make a request, it will in any way affect the religious treatment of the boy. What wonder then, that the request should have been made in the case of only 6 boys out of the 80

that are known to be in the school? And, after all, when the "special request" has been duly made, the sole result is that the boy may be visited twice a week by the priest. He has still to attend the Protestant religious services; and he is still educated as a Protestant. This case is a very hard one, and is in most striking contrast to the provision made for the religious liberty of Catholics by the Reformatory Act, which was passed subsequently to the special Act under which the school at Feltham is maintained. We trust that the facts of this case will undergo a searching examination, and that an adequate remedy will be supplied in the next session of Parliament; for it never could have been intended that Catholic boys should be committed to this school, there to be taught Protestantism at the expense of the ratepayers of the county; neither can we believe that it would be found difficult so to classify the inmates that such among them as are Catholics might receive a Catholic education.

ART. IV.—THE NEWLY DISCOVERED JEWISH
CATACOMB AT ROME.

Cimitero degli Antichi Ebrei, scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini.
Illustrato per Raffaele Garrucci, D.C.D.G. Roma: Coi Tipi della Civiltà
Cattolica. 1862.

*Vetri Ornati di Figure in Oro, trovati nei Cimiteri dei Cristiani Primitivi di
Roma.* Raccolti e spiegati da Raffaele Garrucci, D.C.D.G. Roma:
Salviucci. 1858.

Letters from Rome to Friends in England. By the Rev. JOHN W. BURGON,
M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London: Murray. 1862.

MOST of the recent historians of the Early Church have given a very prominent place to the investigation of its relations with the contemporary religions of the ancient world. Protestants have turned to this subject for confirmation of their favourite theory, which, from the days of the Magdeburg centuriators, traces to the influence of foreign religions all the alleged Roman corruptions of the Apostolic system. And although the prominence which this theory assumed in adverse hands had a certain effect among Catholics in creating a distrustful prejudice against the studies upon which it was based,

yet there has always existed a school of Catholic archaeologists who have confronted the adversary on what they felt to be at least a neutral ground. Many of our most learned writers have not hesitated even to assert our special claim, if not to be heard upon this subject, as being peculiarly our own, at least, instead of permitting the facts which it discloses to be distorted into mere weapons of party polemics, to discuss them calmly in their legitimate bearing,—the scientific illustration of the history of Christian doctrine.

It is, indeed, a very narrow view of a great subject to regard every coincidence of the doctrine or the practice of a Christian church with those of a pagan religion, as a pagan corruption of Christianity. Few things not directly connected with the deposit of faith are plainer in the more philosophical of the writings of the Fathers than the principle that many of the parallelisms of Christianity and paganism in doctrine or in usage, are but evidences in the latter of the lingering memory of a primal revelation not yet entirely passed away—echoes of the Divine voice not utterly extinguished among them by the clamour of human passion, or travestied by the vain but impotent efforts of human intellect.

And this belief has long been a settled doctrine of the Catholic schools. Far from shrinking from the avowal of the parallelisms of "Popery and paganism," industriously traced out by Protestant historians, Catholic scholars have been found to elaborate more minutely the details of the coincidence, and even to eke out the occasionally scanty stores of hostile scholarship with their own more profound erudition. As regards the paganism of the Roman empire, this has ever been a favourite topic with the archaeologists of Italy, and especially of Rome. There is hardly one, from Onofrio Panvini to Padre Garrucci, or Cavaliere de Rossi, who has not contributed to illustrate it; and Marangoni devoted a special volume,* of great learning and of exceeding interest, to a full examination of its various bearings. Frederick von Schlegel has done the same for the ancient religions of India; and Dr. Döllinger, in his work on Heathenism and Judaism,† has carried the inquiry not merely into all the leading families, so to speak, of the ancient religions, but also into the most minute varieties and subdivisions of each; and even into the several schools of philosophy which grew up within each religious system, and

* *Delle Cose Gentilesche e Profane, trasportate ad uso e adornamento delle Chiese.* Opera di Giovanni Marangoni. 4to, Roma, 1744.

† *Heidenthum und Judenthum: Vorhalle zur Geschichte des Christenthums.* Von Joh. Jos. Ign. Döllinger. Regensburg, 1857.

into the modifications which these philosophies underwent through the influence of the national religion, or which they in their turn imparted to the religious system from which they drew their origin.

The relations of early Christianity with Judaism are equally important. They had acquired a prominence even in the days of the Apostles. Probably the very first occasion of discord in the infant Church was the mutual antipathy which the Jew and Gentile elements carried with them into the community in which they became incorporated; and the conflict of doctrinal predilections was not slow to follow the antagonism of race. One of the earliest recorded forms of error arose from the attempt on the part of the neophyte Jews to carry the Law into the Gospel. It is this Judaizing tendency that St. Paul combats with so much earnestness in his Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans; and although the decision of the Council of Jerusalem might seem to have set the question of the obligation of the Mosaic law at rest for ever, it is plain from numberless indications that the Judaizing theory long retained its vitality. For a time it seemed as if the ancient distinction which was maintained among the proselytes to Judaism—between the “proselytes of the gate,” and the “proselytes of righteousness”—was to be transferred to the new religion, and perpetuated therein; nor was it until after the Judaizing tendency had been carried to its full development, and had assumed a distinctly heretical form in the Ebionite and the cognate Judaizing sects, that we can recognise a complete amalgamation of the Hebrew and Gentile elements in the Christian system.

Even before the destruction of Jerusalem, Jewish converts formed a considerable proportion of the Christian community in the several churches of the Roman empire. Perhaps, indeed, the new religion had progressed more rapidly among the Jews of the Dispersion than among the residents of Judea proper. And as nowhere in the western empire were the Jews so numerous as in the city of Rome, the Judeo-Christian element of the primitive Christian Church of that city was proportionally strong. There seems little doubt, indeed, that in the early Church of Rome the foreign members, if not more numerous, were at all events more energetic and more intellectual than the native or Latin Romans.* It is true, that among these

* This is sufficiently shown by Dean Milman, “*Latin Christianity*,” i. 27, and following; although his inferences are more comprehensive than is warranted by the facts on which he relies.

foreign Christians the Greeks were the most numerous, as well as the most learned; but there are abundant evidences that, long after the Apostolic age, not alone the opinions which St. Paul combats in his Epistle to the Romans, but numerous representatives of those opinions, might be found in Rome. It is only the knowledge of this fact that enables us rightly to understand the course of the Paschal controversy.

But, besides the Jewish converts to Christianity at Rome, there must have remained in that city, even after the edict of Claudius, or there must have returned thither after the first storm which that edict evoked had passed away, a large Jewish community. Their principal seat before the expulsion had been the trans-Tiberine region, and it may be presumed that on their return they chiefly congregated in the same quarter; and that there, during the early struggles of Christianity, they continued, a cognate and yet an antagonistic race, side by side with the Christian, subject, in common with them, to the capricious cruelty of the dominant pagan, yet cherishing against them so deadly an animosity as to be ready, when occasion offered, to take part against them even with their common persecutor.

Few things, therefore, would be more interesting to a student of Christian antiquity than to find means of comparing synchronous monuments of these rival communities. And when, during the progress of his protracted archaeological explorations, the celebrated Bosio discovered, outside of the city, on the ancient Via Portuensis, a Jewish catacomb of great antiquity, and seemingly contemporary with the Christian catacombs, which formed the chief object of inquiry, the interest of the learned throughout Europe was excited to a very high degree. Nevertheless, from some cause which it is difficult to understand, the discovery led to no practical result. Strange to say, the very site of the cemetery was forgotten. It has been sought in vain by more than one later antiquarian; and, if we except the short notice of the cemetery which Aringhi has introduced in his great work on the Roman catacombs,* we are left entirely without information as to its character and the monuments which it contains.

In other parts of Italy, and especially in the south, more than one Jewish place of sepulture has since been discovered. An exceedingly interesting catacomb was casually found at Venosa (the ancient Venusium), the Basilicata, in the year

* *Roma Subterranea Novissima. Opera et Studio P. Aringhi, Congr. Orat. Presbyteri Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1659. Lib. ii. cap. xxiii. pp. 231—241.*

1853. It is excavated in the soft limestone of the district, and is divided into corridors (one of which is about seven feet high), in the perpendicular sides of which are cut the niches for the reception of the bodies of the deceased. That this catacomb was Jewish, is demonstrated beyond all doubt, not only by the Hebrew inscriptions and Hebrew names, but also by the unmistakable symbol of the seven-branched candlestick and other well-known Jewish emblems, to which we shall have occasion to refer hereafter. A very large proportion of the inscriptions in this catacomb are in Hebrew. Similar catacombs were discovered in the following year at Oria, and there is reason to believe that throughout Apulia and Calabria many cemeteries of the Jews of the same character may yet be discovered.

All these, however, as being provincial cemeteries, were of far inferior interest, both in themselves and for the purpose of comparison with Christian remains, to what might be expected from the cemeteries of the Hebrew population of Rome. It was with no ordinary satisfaction, therefore, that, in the early part of last year, the antiquarian community of Rome received tidings of the discovery of an ancient Jewish catacomb containing several sculptured monuments and a considerable number of sepulchral inscriptions. This is the Jewish cemetery which forms the subject of Padre Garrucci's essay. The task of investigating such a relic of the Hebrew race, and of illustrating and describing its details, could not possibly have fallen into the hands of a more accomplished commentator. His great work on the ancient Christian *Vetri*, the title of which is prefixed to this article, is a masterpiece of sacred antiquarian science; and among the many glasses which are there described, some of the most curious and interesting are of Jewish origin, and Padre Garrucci's description of them exhibits a most complete and familiar mastery of Hebrew archæology, not alone in its bearing upon the ancient Jewish history and antiquities, but also in reference to the usages of the Jews since the destruction of the Temple, even down to the mediæval and still more recent periods. We need but refer to the admirable chapters upon the glasses which are figured in the fifth plate of this most interesting volume; and which, as we shall see, bear a striking analogy to several of the monuments discovered in the new catacomb.

The newly-discovered cemetery, we should say, is entirely distinct from that which was explored by Bosio. The latter was situated at a place called Colle Rosato, outside of the ancient Porta Portuensis, and may fairly be presumed to have been used as a place of burial chiefly by the trans-Tiberine Jews. The new cemetery is situated outside of the Porta

Capena on the Via Appia. That this, too, was a Jewish quarter may be inferred from Juvenal's lament * over the desecration of the sacred grove and grotto of the nymph Egeria :—

Nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur
Judæis, quorum cophinus fœnumque supellex ;
Omnis enim populo mercedem pendere jussa est
Arbor, et ejectis mendicat sylva Camœnia.

But the character of the tombs and of the inscriptions seems to imply that the families here interred were more wealthy and of a higher social standing than those of Colle Rosato, so far at least as may be gathered concerning the latter from the scanty notice of Aringhi. Many of the monuments of the newly-found cemetery are evidently of the highest dignitaries in the Jewish community. Thus we meet with the tombs not only of "scribes," as ΒΙΤΑΛΙΩ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΟΥC (*Vitalio grammateus*), p. 54; ΝΟΥΜΕΝΙΩ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΟC (*Noumenios grammateos*), p. 55; ΗΟΝΟΡΑΤΟC ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΟC, p. 61; and "doctors of the law," as ΕΥCΕΒΙΟC ΝΟΜΟΜΑΘΗC, p. 57; ΑΜΙΑΝΤΟC ΝΟΜΟΜΑΘΗC, p. 56; but also "rulers of the synagogues," as ΑCΤΕΠΙΟC ΑΡΧΩΝ, ΑCΤΕΠΙΩ ΓΙΕΡΟΥCΙΑΡΧΗ, p. 51; URSACIUS GERUSIARCHES, p. 62, described as ΠΑΤΗΡ CΥΝΑΓΩΓΗC, p. 52; to which, if we may accept P. Garrucci's conjecture, may also be added a still more remarkable class, that of functionaries of which no examples are elsewhere found,—ΜΗΤΗΡ CΥΝΑΓΩΓΗC (mother of the synagogue), p. 52. Another is described, p. 67, as an "archon" and "archi-synagogue, who had held all the dignified offices." No tomb, so far as we have ascertained, has yet been found which can be recognized as of a priest or high-priest.

The site of the newly-found catacomb is a vineyard known as Vigna Randanini. Immediately in front are the remains of a building of some architectural pretensions, and with a mosaic pavement, which, from its form, is conjectured by P. Garrucci to have been a synagogue. From the ruin extends almost in a right line (but with a branch at right angles) the principal street of the catacomb (a passage similar, almost in every respect, to those of the Christian catacombs), in the sides of which are hollowed out the receptacles of the bodies of the dead. In this catacomb, however, the mode of closing up the tombs differs somewhat from that of the Christian catacombs. In the latter the recess is ordinarily closed with a slab, or with

* Sat. iii. 17.

large tiles cemented together. The Jewish tombs are, for the most part, closed with solid masonry, on the outer plaster of which is traced the inscription or device by which the tomb is distinguished. It is remarkable that no trace has been found in any of the tombs hitherto explored of the perfumes, balsams, aromatic spices, and other funeral unguents which are supposed to have been commonly used in the burials of the Jews. In this respect it would be difficult to distinguish a Jewish from a Christian grave.

But there is one very characteristic difference which cannot fail to strike even a casual observer in comparing the Jewish with the Christian catacomb—the almost total absence in the former of those pictorial representations of real objects and of real personages and scenes which form so prominent a feature of the contemporary Christian cemeteries of Rome. The latter, as is well known, abound with representations, either painted or rudely sculptured, of various scenes from the Old or New Testament, of the Blessed Virgin and other saints, as well as with various religious symbols, as the Cross, the Christian monogram, the $\text{I}\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$, the ship, the anchor, and several similar devices. The Jewish cemetery, on the contrary, as might indeed be anticipated from their legal observance, is almost entirely without pictorial decorations of the former class. The devices and representations which are found on the slabs in this catacomb are exclusively symbolical, and the symbols, as far as we have yet seen, are all, without exception, of types already known as characterizing other monuments of the ancient Jewish race.

It will be interesting to transfer a specimen or two to our pages. It will be seen that the figures as well as the characters are extremely rude; and we think it right to add, that the specimens which we have selected have been chosen, not on account of any doctrinal or historical importance, but solely for the groups of symbols and devices which they bear.

In the inscription of the following monument the reader will recognise the same medley of Greek and Latin which is found in many of the inscriptions of the Christian catacombs:—

NEPIA MAR
OSA QV

1

AE BIXIT ANN
IS • IIII



Nepia [$\nu\eta\pi\iota\alpha$] Marosa, quæ bixit [vixit] annis iiii. "The child Marosa, who lived four years."

Our concern, however, is with the symbols which are represented.

The central figure will be easily recognized as the seven-branched candlestick.

On the right is a fruit—a citron or lemon, which is frequently found on the coins and on other monuments of Judea, but whose exact import is not clearly ascertained. With this fruit, on the same side, is associated an ornament, which the antiquarians call by the name *lulab*, and which consists of a bunch of palm or other leaves or flowers. This figure will at once call to mind the well-known palm-branch of the Christian catacombs; and its constant recurrence in Jewish tombs must be regarded as completely decisive against the opinion which at one time prevailed, that the Christian symbol of the palm, although certainly found on martyrs' tombs, might, *of itself*, be safely accepted as an evidence of martyrdom.

Lastly, on the left of the candlestick are a horn and a small vase, probably for oil; both of which objects are, with much probability, connected with the lights of the candlestick; and which, in various combinations, are found in all the *Vetri** of Jewish origin which P. Garrucci has figured in his work.

The following illustration is, in some sense, more interesting, inasmuch as the inscription presents unmistakable evidence as to the religion of the deceased:—

DEVTERO GRA
MATEO BENE
MERENTI
DVLCIS



DVLCIS TO THE WELL-DESERVING SCRIBE, DEUTERUS.

The title *Γραμματέυς*, here rendered *gramateus*, and inflected as a Latin word, is, of course, the same which the Vulgate constantly translates "scribe." Its presence on the tomb implies not only that Deuterus was of Hebrew origin, but that he died a member and an official of the Jewish synagogue. The symbols are in part the same as in the last illustration—viz., the candlestick in the centre, with the citron and the *lulab* (although slightly differing in form) on either side; but we have here a new symbol—the roll or cylinder on the right of the candlestick, which is designed to represent one of the volumes of the law.

* See especially *Tavola V.*

We are tempted to transfer one other specimen ; partly because of one of the objects represented, of which no example has hitherto been given, partly because it illustrates very clearly the Jewish use of prayer for the dead, to which we shall presently refer.



MARCIA BONA IUDEA * DORMI(TIO) TUA I(N) BONIS.

“Marcia, a good Jewess. May thy sleep be amongst the good!”

The figures of the candlestick and oil-vase, on the right side, will be easily recognized. The instrument on the left of the candlestick is supposed to be a forceps, or pair of trimmers, for the purpose of trimming the lights of the candlestick. It strongly resembles an object which is engraved in the Christian catacombs, and which, when found on Christian tombs, is commonly supposed to represent an instrument of torture used in the persecution.

From these and similar examples it will be seen, that the sacred art of the Jewish catacombs differs essentially in its character from that of the contemporary Christian cemeteries. And what is most especially noticeable is the total absence from the former of all representations of the human form, and of all objects and scenes taken from life, even as it is depicted in the Sacred Scriptures.

There is one apparent exception—a sarcophagus on which are sculptured several figures. One of these figures a writer in the “*Bolletino Archeologico*” had explained as representing David playing upon his harp ; but as the figure is plainly a female, and as the instrument which she holds in her hand is a lyre rather than a harp, Padre Garrucci more probably supposes that the figure is meant to represent the muse Urania. This exception, however, is more apparent than real. It is plain that such a representation could not have for a Jew any religious significance; and as the sarcophagus was evidently used by its Hebrew possessor at second, or, perhaps, at third hand, and was intended to be closed up and concealed from view in one of the lateral recesses already described, it is probable that the figures upon it (which, indeed, are in part mutilated and defaced), were regarded as of secondary importance, and that perhaps—with the thrift which still characterizes the Hebrew race—this second-hand sarcophagus was selected, purely from motives of economy, in preference to one without figures, but new, and therefore more costly.

Such a use of the sarcophagus is not solitary in this catacomb. Another has also been discovered, and is described by Padre Garrucci; and it is clear that in this instance it was constructed expressly for Jewish use, and probably for the family of the particular individual whose remains were found enclosed. This sarcophagus is figured by Padre Garrucci, and, although seriously mutilated, is still noticeable as exhibiting the well-known symbol of the seven-branched candlestick.

This contrast of the Jewish and Christian catacombs in the use of images, although antecedently probable, is, nevertheless, not without some doctrinal significance. But far more of real interest attaches to a comparison of the sepulchral inscriptions which were in use in the two communities: and the coincidence of the discovery of this Jewish cemetery with the publication of Cavaliere de Rossi's great work on "Christian Inscriptions" cannot but be regarded as fortunate. Cavaliere de Rossi's work will, of course, demand a separate notice; but we shall devote a few pages of our present number to the Jewish inscriptions, as they stand in Padre Garrucci's able and interesting essay.

So far as they have yet been examined, no very precise data have been discovered by which to determine exactly the period to which they should be ascribed. There is one which, in its original form, clearly contained the names of the consuls; but unfortunately it is mutilated, the letters ENO JUNIOR being the only remaining fragment of the consular names. These, P. Garrucci interprets to mean the Emperor Gallienus; but the conjecture is unsupported by collateral evidence, and can therefore be received only as a conjecture; so that the age of the inscriptions must for the present be judged exclusively from intrinsic evidence. After a careful consideration of the characters and the language, as well its vocabulary as its orthographical peculiarities, we think it impossible to doubt that these inscriptions range within the same limits, speaking generally, as the inscriptions of the Christian catacombs. They present the same curious characteristics which we have more than once had occasion to remark in the Christian inscriptions of Rome. It is very remarkable that scarcely a trace of the Hebrew language is found in these compositions. A large proportion of them are in Greek; the rest, with few exceptions, in Latin.* Some present, like the Christian inscriptions of the same period, a

* The total number of inscriptions given by P. Garrucci is forty-three. Of these, about one-sixth of the names are Hebrew; of the remaining names

curious medley of both languages ; and in some, as in the analogous Christian relics, the Latin is expressed in Greek characters, or, although more rarely, the Greek in Roman ; one case is found in which the scribe, having found it impossible to express in Greek characters the full sound of the Hebrew name of the deceased, has introduced into the midst of the Greek letters the Hebrew consonant *w*, for which he could not find any Greek equivalent.

It is hardly necessary, after this statement, to say that the Jewish inscriptions abound with solecisms in grammar and in orthography, and even with errors in the omission or transposition of letters and syllables, such as characterize the writings of an imperfectly educated class. We may extract a few specimens.

The following is divided into two columns by the well-known figure of the candlestick ; but the columns read continuously as a single line :—

BENE	PQCA
ANPQN	XVII
EKOYMAPI	TOYC
MHCIC	XV

The meaning of this curious inscription will not be evident at first sight ; but although it is differently interpreted in the “*Bolletino Archeologico*,” we have no hesitation in accepting P. Garrucci’s reading, VENEROSA ANRON (*annorum*) XVII, EKOU (ἐκ) MARITUS MESES (*menses*) XV. “*Venerosa*, aged 17, was married for 15 months.” The curious mixture of Greek and Latin inflexions in the word *anron* is hardly more strange than the solecism in the government of *maritus*.

The following is chiefly remarkable for the curious inflexion *omniorum* for *omnium*. This also has the candlestick :—

ALEXANDER
BUCULARIUS DE MA
CELLO QVIXIT ANNIS
XXX ANIMA BONA OM
NIORUM AMICVS
DORMITIO TUA INTER
DICAELS.

one-third are Greek and two-thirds Latin ; and yet, strange to say, the great majority of the inscriptions are in Greek, only twelve being in Latin, and not a single one in Hebrew. This fact, especially when taken in contrast with the inscriptions at Venosa, corresponds pretty closely with what is found of the Christian inscriptions, and strongly confirms the opinion, which is now common among historians, as to the preponderance of the Greek element in the foreign population of Rome, among whom for a time the Christian religion found the larger proportion of its proselytes.

Of the form *omniorum*, although very unusual, there are some examples in the inscriptions already published. We find "*amator pauperorum*" for "*pauperum*." And nothing is more remarkable in the Christian inscriptions than the freedom with which—as here in the word *Dicaeis* (δικαίσις)—the Greek and Latin vocabularies are interchanged. So also, for the peculiar government of the Latin prepositions, as of *inter* with the dative, in this inscription. There are many similar anomalies in this collection. Thus, we have *cum* with an accusative, *CUM VIRGINIUM SUN* for *virginium suum*, p. 50; and again, in p. 52, *Ruffilla* is said to have lived three years, four months, and fifteen days with *Celerinus* (*CUM CELERINUM*).

Perhaps, however, there is no more striking illustration of the synchronous character of these inscriptions generally with the inscriptions of the Christian catacombs, than is to be found in a comparison of those inscriptions, sufficiently numerous in both classes, which, while the language is Latin, are written in Greek characters. The fact that the authors of both the Jewish and the Christian epitaphs are found to have resorted to this device in their inscriptions, would in itself be some evidence of contemporaneity ; but the identity of the execution of the device is, we think, all but conclusive. No one can place one of these Greco-Latin inscriptions of P. Garrucci side by side with one taken at random from Aringhi or Marini, without coming to the inevitable conclusion that they belong to the same period.

The following is a very curious example:—

CEMPONIOYC BACEI
 ΔΕΥC ΑΥΡΗΔΙΑΙ KAMEPEINAI
 KOZOYΓΕΙ BONAI ET
 ΔΙCΚΕΙΠΟΥΔΙΝΑΙ BON
 ΑΙ
 ΚΟΥΝ ΚΟΥΑ ΒΙΞΕΙΤΑΝNEICXZ
 ΦΗΚΙΤ
 ΚΟΖΟΥΓΕΙ BM

SEMPRONIUS BASILEUS AURELIÆ KAMERINÆ CONJUGI BONÆ ET
DISCIPULINÆ BONÆ CUN (CUM) CUA (QUA) VIXIT ANNOS XV. FECIT
CONJUGI BENEMERENTI.

“Sempronius Basileus erected this to Aurelia Camerina, his good wife and beloved disciple, with whom he lived fifteen years.”

There is hardly a single one of these forms which has not a parallel in the Christian inscriptions; and this is but one of several in the Jewish collection of almost precisely similar character.

Assuming, therefore, the contemporaneity of these with the inscriptions of the Christian catacombs, we are at once arrested by the very startling discovery that the formulary of the catacombs on which Catholics have so long relied as evidence of the early Christian use of prayers for the dead, is nothing more or less than a form borrowed from the Jews, or perhaps continued, as a traditional usage of the old religion, by the Jewish proselytes to Christianity. There is hardly one single form of prayer for the dead in the Christian catacombs for which we cannot find a parallel, or perhaps a prototype, in the Jewish inscriptions of the catacomb of Vigna Randanini!

Thus the epitaph of Rufilla, already referred to, concludes with the prayer: EN HIPENE E CYMECIC AYTOEC (ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἣ κοιμήσις αὐτῆς), "MAY HER SLEEP BE IN PEACE," p. 52. The same prayer is appended to the epitaph of the scribe Honoratus, p. 61; to that of "Vitalio the scribe," p. 54; and to that of "Synelice, the daughter of Ursacius," in the same page; to that of "Asterias, Father of the Synagogue, holy and blameless," p. 52; and to that of "Sabina, a holy faithful wife, beloved of all," p. 55.

We may transcribe one of these epitaphs as well for the sake of exemplifying this usage, as in further illustration of the similarity of language and orthography to those of the Christian catacombs to which we have already adverted:—

ΩΔΕ KITE (κείται) ΟΥΡCΑΚΙΑ ΘΥΓΑΤΗΡ
ΟΥΡCΑΚΙΟΥ ΑΠΟ ΑΚΟΥΙΛΕΙΑC ΓΕΡΟΥ
CΙΑΡΧΟΥ ΕΝ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ Η ΚΥΜΙC (κοιμήσις) ΑΥΤΗC

HERE LIETH URSACIA, DAUGHTER OF URSACIUS THE GERUSIARCH, FROM AQUILEIA. MAY HER SLEEP BE IN PEACE!

A similar prayer is appended to the inscription on a monument erected by a Gerusiarch to his parents:—

ASTERIUS THE RULER (OF THE SYNAGOGUE) ERECTED THIS TO HIS PARENTS, ASTERIUS THE GERUSIARCH AND HIS MOTHER LUCINA, WHO LIVED ——— YEARS. MAY THEIR SLEEP BE IN PEACE!

The Latin epitaphs also furnish examples:—

HIC POSITA EPARCHIA THEOSEBES QUÆ VIXIT ANNOS L. D(IES)
VI. DORMITIO TUA IN PACE.

"Here is laid the venerable Eparchia, who lived fifty years and six days. May thy sleep be in peace!"

And there are some in which the epitaph is Latin, and the prayer Greek, although written in Roman characters; thus:—"JUSTUS DECENBRO FRATRI SUO. EN IRENE AE CYMESIS SU," (p. 31). And again, "ESIDORUS ETERUS, EN IRENE QUIMESIS SU," (p. 31). It would be easy to extend the examples of this form of prayer, which is that most commonly found in the inscriptions given by P. Garrucci.

But it is not by any means the only form of prayer for the dead which these epitaphs exhibit. We have already seen in the epitaph of Alexander, an example of another form which is familiar in the Christian catacombs: "MAY THY SLEEP BE WITH THE JUST!" Of this form two other examples occur. The following is very curious:—

ΕΝΘΑΔΕ ΚΕΙΤΕ

ΕΥΘΥΧΙΑΝΟ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΙ [for Εὐτυχιάνος ἄρχων].

ΚΙΝΒΙΟ ΑΞΙΩΝ ΕΥΨΥΧΙ [for συμβιοῦσα ξίος εὐψυχε].

ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΔΙΚΕΩΝ

Η · ΚΥΜΗCΙC ΑΥΤΟΥ

"Here lieth Eutychanos, ruler (of the synagogue), a worthy comrade. Farewell! May thy sleep be with the just!"

The same form is found in the epitaph of Amiantus (p. 56).

A third form of the prayer for the dead (also familiar in the Christian catacombs) occurs twice in these inscriptions. The first has been already quoted:—

MARCIA BONIV.

DEA DORMI · TVA

A · I · BONIS

"Marcia, a good Jewess. May thy sleep be among the good!" (P. 34.)

And (what is plainly the very same form) is found in Greek, p. 35, although the epitaph is imperfect:—

ΕΝΘΑΔΕ ΚΕΙΤΕ

ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟC

ΕΝ ἀγαθοίC

"Here lieth a virgin" (possibly Parthenus may be the name).

"May thy sleep be among the good!"

Without pursuing further the details of the inquiry, it is hardly too much to say that, as regards the frequency of the use of these forms, the Jewish inscriptions come up to, if they do not go beyond, those of the Christians of the same epoch. Indeed, if we were to judge by a comparison of all the known inscriptions of both communions, the proportion of Jewish inscriptions which contain prayers for the dead, is far beyond

that of the Christian. Of the fifty-one epitaphs in P. Garrucci's essay, and the appendix published afterwards, no fewer than thirty-seven contain some one of the forms recited above.

We regret that, for the present, we are unable to do more than thus barely record the first result of P. Garrucci's labours. The news of a discovery which all must regard as deeply interesting in the archæological and historical point of view, has been hailed with special exultation by those who look to the facts of history and archæology solely for their polemical significance; and already, in the more superficial schools, these Jewish epitaphs are confidently appealed to as decisive against the value of the evidence produced by Catholics in favour of prayer for the dead from the epitaphs of the Christian catacombs; since it now seems to be demonstrated that these forms are not of Christian origin, or, as Catholics contend, the genuine exponents of Christian sentiment or Christian belief, but stereotyped conventionalities, copied literally, and at a late period, from the Jews, and a corruption or, at least, an overlaying of the simplicity of primitive truth. Mr. Burgon, in his "Letters from Rome," is especially supercilious in his treatment of the "Roman" view of this question, and indeed of all others connected with the doctrinal teaching of the catacombs. He speaks of the conclusions of Catholic archæologists in a tone of pitying superiority, which might be offensive if it were not rendered simply amusing by the ignorance which betrays itself even through the arrogant self-confidence of its tone.* Our present concern, however, is only with his observations on this formula in the Jewish inscription. Speaking, not of the Jewish inscriptions in this cemetery, but of others either contained in Kirchhoff's collection, or transcribed from the Roman galleries, or the Museum at Naples, he alleges that, "out of about thirty Jewish epitaphs, fifteen state that 'the SLEEP (*κοίμησις*) is IN PEACE.' It may be said, in short, that *Ενθάδε κεῖται Εν εἰρήνῃ ἡ κοίμησις αὐτοῦ* or *αὐτῆς* was the established type of the epitaphs of God's ancient people. Several of the others exhibit the Hebrew word *שלום* (*shalom*), i.e. PEACE." He "infers that both these formulæ are essentially Jewish" (p. 173).

* We cannot help noting one example. The reader may recollect the *forceps*, which is figured in p. 405. Mr. Burgon makes very merry (p. 133) with the "eager imagination which, in this ugly pronged weapon, sees an instrument of torture for the primitive believers." He himself, he assures us, "at once recognized it as a *heathen sacrificial* instrument with which he had been acquainted for years, but the precise use of which he has never met any one who was able to explain!" How wide this is of the truth the reader will collect from what we have said above.

Our space does not permit that we should enter at length into what is, even for its own sake, a subject of great interest and importance. But we cannot help observing that the discovery which is now considered so fatal to the Catholic view, is in its main facts as old as the days of Bosio; that it is distinctly considered by Aringhi, even in the brief chapter which he devotes to Bosio's Jewish catacomb; and that in truth it is but another form of the familiar objection to this, as well as to other Catholic doctrines, from their identity with some of the doctrines or, as Protestant controversialists consider them, superstitions of the Jews. The few epitaphs which were deciphered in Bosio's Jewish catacombs, were as rich in the *ἐν εἰρήνῃ* prayer as those of P. Garrucci. No writer, Jew or Christian, who has ever written upon the Jewish religion, has attempted to gainsay the fact that, in this respect, the Jewish practice is identical with the Catholic.

Whatever, therefore, may be the value of this discovery as a weapon of offence, it is a great mistake to believe that it is a new or untried one. But, in truth, every reasonable mind, far from regarding these inscriptions, and the interesting form in which they present what had long been known to be the Jewish doctrine as to the dead, in the light of an objection to the Catholic belief and practice of prayer for the dead, must be led thereby to the very opposite conclusion. The most plausible answer to the Catholic argument from the epitaphs of the catacombs is that offered by Maitland, and by his far more learned and ingenious Edinburgh Reviewer,—that the ejaculatory forms regarded by Catholics as prayers are mere apostrophes—poetical aspirations expressive of the affectionate regret with which men naturally follow even to the grave the lost objects of their love; but that in the mind of the Christian mourner they had no specific doctrinal meaning, and, in truth, no significance beyond what would have been attached to them in the thoughts of the heathen from whom they were borrowed, and with whom they could not imply a prayer for happiness beyond the grave, since such a prayer could have no place in the aspirations of “those who have not hope.”

Mr. Burgon has adopted this answer, and contends with much earnestness that the epitaphs of the catacombs are to be regarded not as “prayers,” but simply as “pious aspirations.”

I think it superfluous to point out, that, in all that precedes, though there may be thought here and there to have been a singular leaning towards the tastes of pagan Rome, to modern Romanism there is not the faintest approximation of an allusion. Then, for the actual inscriptions, I need not say that words of peace are the common property of all believers; while the image

of Sleep, ever since the Holy Spirit dictated the 4th and 5th Psalms, has been familiar with the whole Christian world. Is it not related of S. Stephen, the first martyr, that "he fell asleep"? To say of one who lived professing a pure faith, and who died with a good hope, that he "rests in God," or "in the Holy Spirit," is to say what is familiarly believed (thank Heaven!) in all the churches of Christendom.

But it seems to be thought that a pious aspiration on behalf of the departed, because it naturally assumes the form of a prayer, is a rebuke to us of the English Church. I cannot, for my own part, think of it; or feel that it is any rebuke at all. Waiving the recorded history of prayers for the dead, there is nothing in the inscriptions from the catacombs which could be seriously maintained to sanction it at all. It is to be observed that these are all apostrophes addressed to the departed: "Mayest thou live in God!" "God refresh thy spirit!" and the like. Now this is the language of natural piety, which has found vent, and will find vent, among all people and in all ages, to the end of time. Thus, heathen Greece would write above a grave as follows:—

"Be of good cheer, O lady; and to thee
Osiris give to quaff the cooling water."

Or thus:—

"In precious odours be thy soul, my child!"

And heathen Rome:—

"O fare thee well! Thy mother prays thee, take,
Yea, take me to thyself. Again, farewell!"

The simple truth is, that one who has followed the object of his affection to the edge of the valley of the shadow of death cannot be mute. No one ever suspected Legh Richmond of invocation of saints (or of belief in the Shades either) when he began an epitaph: "Forgive, blest shade, the tributary tear," &c.; or Bishop Lowth, when he wrote upon his daughter's grave, "Eja, age, in amplexus, cara Maria, redi!"

On Professor Hussey's tomb at Sandford is written, "Requiescat." But did any one ever suspect that good and great man, or his admirable relatives ("honest John Ley," for example, or Jacob) of a sneaking kindness for Romanism? And yet, what should we not have heard if, on the sepulchral slab of a famous teacher known to be buried in the catacombs, such words were found written? About six years ago, some verses appeared in the *Times* on the occasion of the funeral of the greatest captain of modern times, in which a passage began, "God rest his gallant spirit! give him peace!" Rather a long-ea—, I mean rather a lynx-eyed friend, immediately inquired whether that was not a prayer for the dead? A blind man ought to perceive that nothing is less intended on such occasions. Was Lord Byron praying for the dead when he wrote some stanzas beginning, "Bright be the place of thy soul"?*

So confident does Mr. Burgon appear to feel in the conclu-

* *Letters from Rome*, pp. 236–8.

siveness of this reply to the Roman inference, that he has even prefixed, as the running title of these pages, the derisive words, "*Pious Aspirations not Prayers.*" It is hardly worth while to consider seriously what is the distinction contemplated by Mr. Burgon. It is not easy to understand how a "pious aspiration" can be other than a "prayer." An "aspiration" is only "pious" in so far as it is addressed directly or indirectly to God; and, if it be addressed to God, it is an abuse of words to call it other than a prayer. Possibly, Mr. Burgon attaches some weight to the *form* of these aspirations, which, he says, are all "apostrophes—addressed to the departed." But even if it were to be admitted that the form of the address could have the effect of changing its essential character, it is utterly untrue that the "aspiration" never occurs except in the form of an "apostrophe addressed to the departed." In an article upon Maitland's "*Church in the Catacombs,*" written many years since,* will be found, among the many examples of prayer for the departed which occur in the catacombal epitaphs, instances in which the "aspiration" appears as addressed, not to the deceased in the second person, but to God, regarding the deceased, and in the third person; and several even of the Jewish epitaphs in Padre Garrucci's "*Cimitero*" follow the same form.†

This consideration, however, is entirely beside the question; and even if it could be shown that the Christian epitaphs of the catacombs are but transcripts of what it pleases Protestant critics to describe as the "rhetorical apostrophes," or "pious aspirations" of the inscriptions on heathen tombs, it would by no means follow that they did not imply, in the thought and intention of the Christians, a real prayer for the deceased, even in the strictly Roman sense. No one can doubt that the words in themselves, and of their own natural import, imply a prayer for the happiness of the deceased; and even if it were clearly established that such was not the sense attached to them by the heathens who engraved them on the tombs of their deceased relations, the argument, as applied to the analogous Christian use of them, would at best be but a negative one. It would, perhaps, follow that they *did not necessarily* imply a prayer on the part of the Christians; but it would by no means follow that they *might not*, or even that they *did not*, imply such a prayer.

But, considering the question on its own merits, is it true, as

* DUBLIN REVIEW, vol. xxi.

† See p. 35; and again, p

Protestant critics thus flippantly assume, that these epitaphs, as employed by heathens, did not imply a prayer for the deceased? So far from the truth is this confident assumption, that, on the contrary, no possible doubt can be entertained as to the reality of the prayer. Crude and perhaps degrading as were the notions regarding the condition of the deceased embodied in the ancient Gentile religions, nothing is more certain than that they all contained in some form the principle of a purgation after death, through which the soul is admitted eventually to happiness. Dr. Döllinger* has established this by unquestionable evidence, and it is impossible to doubt that these deprecatory forms inscribed upon the tombs, however they may eventually have been degraded into mere conventionalities, had in their original use no other signification.

We cannot help thinking, too, that Mr. Burgon has been singularly infelicitous in his selection of examples. Whatever might be said of the paganism of ancient Greece and Rome, certainly no one who has ever bestowed a thought on the mythology of the Egyptians, and especially since the labours of Brugsch and other editors of that wonderful relic of hieroglyphic literature, the so-called "Todten-buch," could for a moment entertain a doubt as to the popular belief of Egypt on the subject of prayers for the dead, or call into question the meaning of the prayer to Osiris in the epitaph to which Mr. Burgon refers in the above extract,—

Εὐψύχει, κυρία, καὶ δοιή σοι ὁ Ὅσιρις το ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ.

"Be of good cheer, lady, and may Osiris grant thee the cool water!"

But it is time to conclude, especially as we have allowed ourselves to be drawn away from our immediate subject—the epitaphs of the Jewish catacombs. We must observe, however, before we close, that it is in relation to these epitaphs that the weakness of Mr. Burgon's reasoning is most clearly apparent. If it were true, as Mr. Burgon and those from whom he borrows his view triumphantly allege, that the intercessory Christian epitaphs are but echoes of those of the Jews, carried into the Christian Church by the early Jewish proselytes, it ought to follow that, with the practice of inscribing such epitaphs, must also have been introduced the doctrine on which these epitaphs are founded, as well as the religious observances which they represent, and from which they draw all their significance. And hence we contend that,

* Heidenthum und Judenthum, p. 374 ; and again, 432 and 541.

far from furnishing an argument against the Catholic doctrine, the identity of the Jewish usage with that of the catacombs is in itself the strongest confirmation of the justice of the construction which Catholics have put upon the latter.

If the "pious aspirations" of the catacombs are borrowed from the Jews, these "pious aspirations" must beyond all question be held to be not merely "prayers for the dead," but prayers fully realizing the Roman ideal. If the form of the epitaphs were in itself ambiguous, no better interpreter of the doubt could be suggested than the popular belief as to the sense in which they were used. Now we need but refer to the well-known passage in the twelfth chapter of the Second Book of the Machabees in order to make it plain, that in the mind of a Jew the prayer for "rest," for "life," or for "peace," had precisely the same significance which it has in the mind of a modern Catholic. We do not care to press for the canonicity of this book, or even for its inspiration. But even taking the very lowest view of it which the most extreme rationalist would demand; ignoring entirely all its higher claims; accepting the very latest date which has been assigned by adverse critics for its composition; and appealing to it solely as a human but yet authentic witness of contemporary opinion;—we learn from it that, at least a century and a half before the time of our Lord, prayer and sacrifice "for the sins of the dead"* formed an established ordinance of the Jewish people. Who can doubt as to the sense of the "pious aspirations" of the epitaphs of such a people? Who can hesitate to believe that the touching addresses which they engraved upon the tombs of their dead were but another form of the pious hope with which they followed them beyond the grave? Nay, who can fail to gather from it this further and still more striking coincidence with Catholic belief, that beyond the grave our prayers may avail, even for those who departed with the stain of still unforgiven, although venial transgressions? The visitant of these long-forgotten tombs feels as vividly as one who stands among the gravestones of a modern Catholic cemetery, that they are the last resting-places of a people who believe it to be "a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins."

But there is yet another point in reference to which the evidence of these Jewish epitaphs is extremely important. In the review of Maitland's "*Church in the Catacombs*," already referred to, will be found a large number of epi-

* 2 Mach. xii. 42-48.

taphs which contain a direct and explicit prayer for the dead, couched in a great variety of forms, but many of them bearing a strong resemblance to the language of these Jewish inscriptions. Besides these inscriptions, however, there is a numerous class of early Christian inscriptions, which do not explicitly present the form of a prayer, but are susceptible, so far as regards their language, either of a declaratory or of a deprecatory sense. Such are, for example, the numerous epitaphs which contain the simple words *IN PACE* ("In Peace"), and which might be understood either to *declare* that the departed soul is "in peace," or to convey a *prayer* that the departed soul *may be* "in peace." Such, again, are the inscriptions, *Εν εἰρήνῃ ἡ κοίμησις σου*, *Εν εἰρήνῃ ἡ κοίμησις αὐτοῦ*, or the Latin *Dormitio tua* (or *ejus*) *in Pace*. These forms, so far as grammatical construction is concerned, might equally mean, "Thy (or his) sleep *is* in peace," or "*May* thy (or his) sleep *be* in peace." For Catholics, who believe that the early Christians did really pray for their dead, the ambiguous form assumes a significance from what they believe to have been the mind of the writers; but this interpretation is, perhaps not quite unfairly, questioned by Protestants as an assumption of the point at issue. They claim that all such forms should, at all events, be put aside in the discussion, as, at the very least, doubtful and indecisive.

Now, by a curious coincidence of usage, the very same diversity of form is discoverable in the Jewish epitaphs. Some of them are clearly couched in the deprecatory form; but some also, and a considerable number, present the same ambiguity which is observable in those of the Christian catacombs. Thus, some present simply the word *שלום* "Peace," which corresponds with the "*IN PACE*" of the Christians. Others have the same *Εν εἰρήνῃ κοίμησις*, *Dormitio in Pace*, which we find in the Christian catacombs.

And we cannot omit to observe the doctrinal importance of this coincidence. These epitaphs, like all equivocal forms, must be interpreted by the sense in which they were understood by the writers. If, for example, either of them were met with in a Catholic graveyard, no one could entertain a moment's doubt that, whatever ambiguity might attach to it if it were found in a Protestant cemetery, it had been placed in the Catholic graveyard with no other object than as a prayer. In point of fact, nothing is more usual on Catholic tombstones at the present day than the initial letters *R. I. P.* These letters might represent either *Requiescat in Pace*, *May he rest in peace*; or, *Requiescit in Pace*, *He resteth in peace*. And yet, no one would doubt which sense the Catholic mourner meant to

convey. Now, we contend that, by the very same principle, we are bound to understand all such forms in the Jewish epitaphs as deprecatory ; knowing as we do by the historical evidence of the Second Book of Machabees, that it was the practice of the Jews to pray for their dead. And if Mr. Burgon, and those who have written in the same spirit as to the Jewish origin of the forms of inscription which are found in the Christian catacombs, seek to use that circumstance as an argument against the practice of prayer for the dead which Catholics justify by the example of the early Christians, they are at least bound to accept the facts in their integrity ; and they cannot refuse to regard the *IN PACE* and other ambiguous Christian forms of the catacombs as strictly deprecatory, since the similar forms of the Jews are proved by the recorded practice of that people to have been used in a purely deprecatory sense. The result must be a large addition to the number of deprecatory epitaphs, and, of course, of the express evidences of the actual practice of prayer for the dead among the primitive Christians.

Far from shrinking, therefore, from this inquiry into the alleged analogies of Jewish and Roman practice, we regard them as in many respects a strong antecedent testimony of the fidelity with which Rome has understood and preserved the traditions of the primitive Church. No intelligent Catholic will hesitate as to the avowal of the existence of such analogies. The appearance of Padre Garrucci's interesting essay simultaneously with the great work of De Rossi on the Christian catacombs, is one of the happiest illustrations which we could have desired. It is a kind of Jewish commentary on the Christian text.

ART. V.—THE LETTERS OF S. TERESA.

Lettres de Sainte Térèse, traduites suivant l'ordre chronologique. Edition enrichie de lettres inédites, de notes, et de biographies, par le P. MARCEL BOUX, de la Compagnie de Jésus. 3 tom. Paris : Lecoffre & Cie.

WE are at the distance of not much less than three centuries from the death of S. Teresa, and yet all the popularity and high esteem in which her writings have been held, and the great influence that she has exercised in the Church during the interval have not availed to secure the production of a perfectly complete and faithful edition of her works till our own time. Within a few years of her death, liberties were taken with the text, even in the editions published at Madrid. The evil increased in subsequent editions and translations, especially in the Latin versions published at Mayence in 1605, and at Antwerp in 1631. The latter is important on its own account, and also as having been made the basis of the current translations in France and other countries, having been used by Arnauld d'Andilly for his French version, which appeared in 1670. The mutilation of the text was so flagrant, that it was made a matter of solemn and public complaint by the General Chapter of the Discalced Carmelites of Italy in 1650. The early mutilators were chiefly impelled by their hatred of the Company of Jesus, of which S. Teresa had spoken, in more than one place, in terms of the highest eulogium. Arnauld had an additional motive for dishonesty in the opinions of the party to which he belonged. The text that he followed was already corrupted; but he perverted and disguised the meaning of the Saint in several passages where he had not this excuse. Yet Arnauld's version seems to have established itself in France, and it has been reprinted in our day, in preference to others, by M. Migne. Besides the faults just mentioned, it follows the Antwerp edition in leaving out one whole chapter and the half of another—among the most charming and interesting in the work—of the “Book of the Foundations.” Few versions in other languages are so bad as Arnauld's in this respect. The earliest English translations, by Sir Tobie Matthews in 1623 or 1642, and by Abraham Woodhead in 1669-76, are free from Jansenist dishonesty, but they could not, of course, be more faithful than the Spanish editions from which they were made. That which has been published in our own day by Canon Dalton was unfortunately

undertaken before the appearance of the work of P. Bouix, the completion of which we have now to acknowledge in the volumes before us.

P. Bouix has not been content with the existing Spanish text. He has carefully and conscientiously collated the original manuscripts—happily still in existence—of all the important works of S. Teresa. He has thus, while engaged only in translation, prepared the materials for a completely correct edition of the original text, which, in the preface to his first volume, he has undertaken some day to publish. His services, however, to the works of S. Teresa go far beyond the restoration and translation of the original text. He has collected a great number of biographical notices and illustrations, which are inserted in appropriate places throughout his volumes. We have thus a kind of portrait gallery of the relations, friends, and companions of S. Teresa. Numerous as these notices are, the reader will be more inclined to complain that P. Bouix has been too sparing of them than that he has been over prodigal. The characters with which they deal are so interesting, and the colours in which they are portrayed are so bright and clear, that it seems as if the freshness and charm which pervade the writings of the saint herself had been communicated to the editorial matter in which they are encased.

Great, however, as are the services rendered by P. Bouix to other portions of S. Teresa's remains, it is especially for the three volumes now before us that those who wish to study her character closely will feel most grateful to him. He has been the first to make her letters really available as a supplementary commentary on her life. He has not, indeed, added to any noticable extent to the number of existing letters; but the correspondence has never before been satisfactorily arranged in chronological order, and it requires, more perhaps than her connected works, the personal notices and historical illustrations with which he has enriched it. In the best Spanish editions no attempt has been made at placing the letters in order of time. The French translation by the Mère de Maupeau attempted this, but not with perfect success. In our own country, Canon Dalton, who has translated some of the letters from the Spanish, gives up such an arrangement altogether as not worth the trouble that it would cost, on account of the want of connection between one letter and another. We think, however, that it cannot be doubted that this is a great mistake. It was the lot of S. Teresa, for several years of her life, to have to labour incessantly and anxiously for a great and noble cause, that of the Reform of the Carmelite

Order, and to have no means of external action but her correspondence. The mere number of her letters was very great—writing was one of her principal occupations. The readers of the volumes before us will be at no loss for proofs of her laborious activity in this respect, though only a poor percentage of its fruits has survived to our time. Over and over again we find her telling her correspondents that her head is aching painfully,—it is one or two hours after midnight, and her messenger has to leave early in the morning. Often she is obliged to make a single letter serve for several persons, and yet complains that the number she writes is too great for her strength. A large proportion of them were on matters of vital importance, and she had to be in frequent communication with the most influential persons of her day. The time of her greatest exertions was also that of the greatest danger to the cause to which she was so devoted—when she was herself in a kind of imprisonment in the convent at Toledo, by order of the General Chapter of Piacenza. Her enemies and friends alike testified to the power with which at that time she wielded her pen—the only weapon she had besides prayer. She had frequently to discover that her letters had either miscarried by accident, or been intercepted by design. During the whole of the period during which the persecution against the Reformed Carmelites was raging, she had to use a complete set of fictitious names with her intimate correspondents, and to speak of herself in them in the third person, and sometimes under different *noms de guerre* in the same letter. All this was to prevent the opposite party, into whose hands the letters might possibly fall, from knowing her plans and secrets. The enemies of the Reform were neither few nor inactive, and, for a time, were almost all-powerful. It is possible that, besides their endeavours to intercept her letters, it was their fear of the influence she exerted by this means that made them think at one time of sending her to America—an ingenious method of getting rid of a formidable subject now and then adopted by the religious superiors of that time. If her enemies feared her power, her friends acknowledged and depended upon it. Philip II. was throughout a staunch friend of the Reform, though he had his own royal way of supporting it, to which, perhaps, not a few of its misfortunes were owing, and though during the latter and most critical part of the conflict through which it had to pass, he allowed himself for a time to be chilled in his zeal by the mistakes made by some of its leading friars; but he always listened to S. Teresa, for whom he had a great reverence, with the utmost respect; and it is probable that if we knew more intimately the history of the

events which led to his final interference in favour of the Reform,—when, indeed, but for him, it would to all outward appearance have been suppressed,—we should find that the letters of our Saint to him brought about the change. They ought certainly to have had more weight with Rossi, the General of the Carmelites, than appears to have been the case; but he was in a distant country, and although, when in Spain, he had become acquainted with Teresa and conceived for her the highest esteem, it appears that at a later period his mind was considerably prejudiced against her. With the members of the Reform themselves, her letters had almost always the highest authority. Their leading men looked to her for almost continual advice and guidance, and their greatest mistakes were always made at the times that they allowed themselves to disregard her counsels. The time of which we speak was one of the greatest trial and anxiety, not only to those in authority among them, but to every single convent and monastery that followed the new rule. All looked to Teresa, in her prison at Toledo, for encouragement, direction, and consolation. There was also a large amount of what may be called the ordinary business of the numerous convents she had founded, which had to pass through her hands; and although she was hardly ever free from illness and bodily suffering of some kind, she fulfilled wonderfully the requirements of her extraordinary position. Her letters sustained and guided the Reform through that terrible crisis, and she could still find the time to satisfy the claims of more ordinary correspondence, without withdrawing herself from the regular observances of the conventual life—singular only in stealing from the hours allotted to necessary repose the time required for writing.

This was a correspondence of no common character. If it existed in any form approaching, even distantly, to completeness, it would be of inestimable value and interest. But, at all events, to understand it at all, it must be arranged chronologically, and not, as in the Spanish editions followed by Canon Dalton, according to the persons to whom the letters are addressed. In any case, also, it would require copious illustration; and with all that has been done in this way by P. Bouix, and others who have preceded him, it is not surprising that we still meet here and there with an unintelligible sentence. The fragmentary state in which we possess this correspondence does not obviate the necessity of chronological arrangement. It is true that, as it is, there is often no connection between the letters that have to be placed side by side; still, if anything can make them give us a living and speaking picture of S. Teresa, it is just that chronological order

which the Madrid editions do not give. Nor is this arrangement really difficult. The Saint had an unfortunate habit of not putting the year into the date of her letters; but after the labours of the Bollandists, the task of P. Bouix has been comparatively easy, and the letters that cannot be assigned to a certain place are few and unimportant.

We have already hinted that the entire collection gives us but a very small proportion of the letters S. Teresa must have written. The sum total of those that have survived hardly exceeds 350, and these are scattered over a period of twenty years. It seems, at first sight, a strangely small number, when we remember in what veneration our Saint was held even during her lifetime. But many causes—some of them rather curious—have combined to cheat us of the remains that we should prize so highly. Letters are always the most perishable of relics; and even when they have been saved from destruction, it is not easy to collect and publish them. But in this case we find S. Teresa herself frequently begging her correspondents to destroy them as soon as read; and the circumstances under which she wrote made this as much a matter of necessary prudence as it might have been of saintly humility. Enemies were all around, ready to use against her and her friends any information they might obtain from an intercepted letter. We may illustrate this statement by a characteristic anecdote of S. John of the Cross. Any reader of S. Teresa will remember the many places in which she speaks of him in terms of the warmest praise and admiration. Although, strange as it may seem to us, he does not appear to have been looked up to as a leader and guide by the Carmelites of the Reform, he was in reality the one among them who most thoroughly understood S. Teresa's idea, and whose feelings and judgment were invariably on the same side with those of our Saint. It is not wonderful, therefore, that she should have kept up a brisk correspondence with him, nor that he should have treasured up her letters with particular care and veneration. What has become of them? It has been thought by some that he destroyed them out of humility, lest they should disclose to others the high opinion entertained of him by their writer. But, in fact, he had another motive. One of the arbitrary and cruel acts of persecution to which as a member of the Reform of Mount Carmel he had to submit, was his sudden and forced removal from the convent of the Incarnation, at Avila, in 1578. S. Teresa had placed him there as Confessor some years before, while she was herself governing the convent as Prioress, and he had been her chief instrument and helper in bringing back the religious to an exemplary regularity of observance, and in advancing

them greatly in perfection. In 1578, the majority among them gave their votes a second time for Teresa, in the election of Prioress, and this so exasperated the Nuncio Segá—a determined enemy of the Reform—and the authorities of the Province, that the nuns were put under excommunication, the candidate named by the minority placed in office, and—when some of these harsh measures were overruled by the interference of the royal authority—orders were sent secretly to arrest and imprison S. John of the Cross, to whose influence the election of Teresa was attributed. He was seized and taken immediately to the monastery of the unreformed Carmelites at Avila, to the custody of whose Prior he was committed. The Prior, we are told, was making his thanksgiving after mass, and S. John waiting quietly in the sacristy till he had finished. Suddenly, he remembered his treasured packet of S. Teresa's letters. He had left it in his cell, in a little house in the convent garden, which he occupied as confessor. It would be seized at once, and its contents examined! S. John at once ran off, reached the place in safety, though hotly pursued, and having locked himself in, set to work to destroy the letters, tearing up some, and actually *swallowing* others. When his object was accomplished, he surrendered himself tranquilly to his pursuers, who treated him for many months with the utmost cruelty. Another of S. Teresa's greatest friends was the celebrated Anne of Jesus. When she presented herself as a novice, S. Teresa told her that she received her rather as her own companion in the work of the Foundations; and, in fact, she afterwards introduced the Reform into Granada, Madrid, Paris, and Brussels. She, too, was in constant intimate correspondence with Teresa during the whole time of the persecution, and her exertions for the Reform were so great, so wisely directed, and so successful, that our Saint attributed to her the final victory. Where are S. Teresa's letters to her? We must lay the blame of this loss upon their author herself, who, shortly before she died, requested Anne of Jesus to destroy them. Two or three alone remain: one, however, a most remarkable and valuable specimen, inasmuch as it contains one of the most severe *scoldings* that our Saint ever wrote, tempered, as always, by her consummate sweetness and charity. It is, perhaps, to its severity that we owe its preservation. We have thus accounted for the loss of two, at least, of the most valuable sets of letters that came from S. Teresa's pen. Other causes, moreover, of the havoc that we now so much deplore may easily be added to those already mentioned. People cared more to get a scrap of her writing than to preserve her letters unmutilated for posterity. Again, a great number of them

were dictated, and only signed by S. Teresa. The signature was cut off and preserved, and the letters thrown aside as valueless. It was a fashion, too, among the devout people of those days to make up the name, or some favourite motto of a saint, out of pieces of his or her own handwriting. Many of S. Francis Xavier's letters were destroyed to make up in this way the name "Francis." The editor of the version of his letters published at Bologna, mentions an instance of this practice which bears upon our present immediate subject. He tells us that in a convent in that town he had often seen a reliquary containing the words, "Teresa de Jesus, o morir o padecer," formed in this manner out of our Saint's handwriting. With our notions, it is scarcely conceivable that people should have thus cut up letter after letter, without taking the trouble to transcribe them first; but their devotion was to the handwriting, and they cared less for the thoughts committed to it. At all events, with all these methods of destruction at work, it seems almost more surprising that we possess any of S. Teresa's letters than that we have so few.

We must distinguish between the different periods into which the life of our Saint is naturally divided, in order to answer the further question which we now ask, not without trembling, as to the actual value of what remains to us of her vast and varied correspondence. Do we really gain much from these scanty relics, left to us, as it were, by hazard from so many causes of destruction,—her own humility, the prudence that her circumstances required, the obedience of her friends, the fear of prying enemies, and the inconsiderate piety of her devotees? Happily, the case is not quite so bad as it looks at first sight. S. Teresa's life, like that of many who have, like her, been raised up to do some mighty work in the Church, divides itself into two parts. There was first the long period of which she has, to some extent, given an account in her Autobiography, embracing her youth till her entrance into religion at the age of eighteen, and the first twenty-six or twenty-seven years of her cloister life, passed in the great convent of the Incarnation at Avila. The readers of the work just named will easily understand that this was the quietest and most inactive part of her life: its latter years, especially, were her apprenticeship in the wonderful ways of prayer of which she has left so striking a description; and it is during this time that, with but few cares and thoughts beyond the walls of her convent or the interests of those dearest to her, her character was shaped, matured, and strengthened—

Scalpri salubris ictibus,
Et tunsione plurimâ—

for the great part that she was afterwards to play. There was no hurry about the providential preparation of Teresa. She was more than forty when she began to receive great supernatural favours in prayer : she was forty-three when she fell in with her young but highly gifted director, who was to guide her only a few years indeed, but who was to have the chief hand in leading her to the most consummate perfection,—Father Balthasar Alvarez. At the age of forty-five, she was allowed by him to make her famous vow — always to do that which she should know to be most perfect. Up to this time of her life we know, comparatively, but very little of S. Teresa except what she has told us herself. No letters remain of this, the first and longest half of her earthly career : she may have written, perhaps, to her brother in South America, or to other members of her family ; but it is not likely that at this time her correspondence could have been extensive. It widened naturally as the time approached when she was to become a person of action, intrusted with a work that was to bring her into contact, and often into collision, with people of all countries and characters.

S. Teresa's earliest extant letters are, however, on personal matters. The extraordinary gifts that she received in prayer had often filled her with alarm lest they should be delusions from the enemy of souls,—an alarm, indeed, chiefly fostered by the apprehensions of some pious but inexperienced friends, to whom everything with which they were themselves unacquainted was suspicious. She had from time to time consulted various persons of eminence for sanctity and learning on this subject ; and no one had done more to quiet and reassure her than S. Peter of Alcantara, whose acquaintance she made during a visit that he paid to Avila about 1559. The first pieces — we can hardly call them letters — contained in P. Bouix's volumes are accounts of her interior condition and state of prayer, addressed to him, in the following year, and to others of her confessors. The effect of his influence upon her at this time of her life is very remarkable, and deserves to be more fully drawn out than our space would permit. He not only gave her thorough security and satisfaction as to the safety of the path by which she had been led, but he was her great helper and guide at this most critical moment of transition, when she was about to launch forth upon the adventurous enterprise of her Reform, literally not knowing whither she went. There is something at once striking and touching in the venerable figure of S. Peter, on the brink of the grave, worn down to a skeleton by austerities and mortifications, and inured to every kind of difficulty and contradiction

in the establishment of his own Reform, handing on the torch of renovation to the innocent and enthusiastic Teresa, perfectly unconscious as she was of the extent of the work she was undertaking, and of the fiery trials and numberless crosses to which it would expose her. S. Peter seemed to have lived just long enough to start the enterprise of S. Teresa. He insisted with particular earnestness upon a point which had not been included in her original design,—that of the absolute poverty of the convent she was to found. She had a difficulty in persuading herself that this was practicable, and when she had resolved upon it, under S. Peter's influence, it became the subject of a long conflict, first with her own friends and advisers at Avila, then with the bishop under whose jurisdiction the convent was to be placed; and finally, when the foundation had actually taken place, with the authorities of the town, who resolved to suppress the new institution chiefly on this ground. S. Teresa's friends, and the bishop himself, yielded at last to the strong influence, vigorously exerted, of S. Peter. The contest with the town involved a long and costly suit before the Royal Council at Madrid, which was not finally settled till the spring of 1563—the convent having been founded in August, 1562. S. Peter died about two months after the foundation. He thus survived long enough to witness the beginnings of the furious storm of opposition that assailed the infant convent, and to encourage Teresa in her troubles, congratulating her upon them as a sure sign that our Lord would be greatly served and honoured by her community. She tells us also that after his death she derived signal aid from him. At one time, worn out by the continued and universal clamour against her establishment, and herself prevented from joining the few novices who composed its members, and on whom the brunt of the battle fell—for she was at that time forbidden to leave the convent of the Incarnation—she was induced to acquiesce in the arrangement of a compromise, by which the town of Avila was to consent to the foundation, on condition that it should be endowed. There was some ground on her side for such a concession, as the brief from Rome, under the authority of which the foundation had been made, did not speak quite explicitly on the point of absolute poverty. The agreement was drawn up, and the day appointed for its signature. The night before, however, she was warned in her prayer against the step. Our Lord told her that if she gave up the point of poverty now, she would never be able to recover it. It was, in fact, in the hope of making an alteration after some time had elapsed that she had consented. S. Peter also appeared to her; this time—

she had seen him before more than once since his death—with a severe countenance, reproving her for having abandoned his counsel, and encouraging her with the assurance that if she fought out this battle bravely, all would afterwards go well. After that time she never wavered more.

There is hardly a single letter remaining to us from S. Teresa's pen at this time. She must have written many, as the conduct of the whole conflict devolved upon her, and she was not allowed to join her novices in the new convent of S. Joseph till its conclusion. Her chief agents, however, were a few devoted friends, priests and laymen, living in the town; so that a great part of the business, and much of her communications with her spiritual children, may have been carried on orally. The occasion, however, for this exceptional activity soon passed away. About the feast of S. Joseph, in 1563, she obtained leave from her Provincial to migrate to her new home with four other religious of the convent of the Incarnation—not, however, till she had urged her request on her reluctant superior in the memorable words: "Take heed, my father, lest you resist the Holy Ghost." After this victory, we find an interval in her life of between four and five years, which corresponds accurately with a gap in the collection of letters that remain to us. These years were spoken of by S. Teresa as the happiest and most tranquil of her life—passed in the newly-founded convent, beyond which, at that time, her desires and plans did not extend, in perfect retirement, without any of those frequent visits from the world without, or even absences from the cloister, which had caused her so much distraction in her former religious life, in deep but abundantly-supplied poverty, in the fervent practice of the full primitive rule of S. Albert—to which, indeed, she herself had even added certain regulations as to prayer and mortification which enhanced its rigour—and in the company of her few but fervent religious, a great contrast to the multitudinous and rather heterogeneous inmates of the convent of the Incarnation. She has herself described the joy that she felt in living with souls so devotedly bent on perfection, and so highly favoured by divine grace. It was in this quiet and happy interval—the prelude to many busy and stormy years—that she composed the account of her life as we now possess it (the first copy, finished shortly before the foundation, not being in existence), as well as her beautiful work, the "Path of Perfection." But during a period like this, it is not to be expected that she should have been a great letter-writer, and we need not complain of the indiscreet devotion of her

admirers as having robbed us of memorials which probably never existed.

This interval passed, we find ourselves, in the year 1567, on the brink, as it were, of the active and bustling portion of S. Teresa's life, and which, in fact, embraces all her remaining years. From 1568, the letters that we possess become comparatively numerous; and the single letter of 1567—if, indeed, it be rightly assigned to this year by P. Bouix — forms a significant and appropriate introduction, short as it is, to the series that follows it. P. Bouix understands a request it contains for a letter of recommendation from the Bishop of Avila, to whom it is addressed, to refer to S. Teresa's desire to be favourably introduced by that prelate to the General of her own order, then on a visit to Spain. If this is so, it refers to the providential incident which opened the way for S. Teresa to the great work with which her name will ever be associated in the Church. We have remarked already upon the gradual and leisurely manner in which she had been prepared during so many years of her life, in the convent of the Incarnation, to be the instrument of founding a new convent in which the primitive rule of the Carmelite order was to be observed. She had, as we have said, no perfectly adequate idea of the full requirements of the original rule itself when she first undertook the work; for the obligation of absolute poverty was first pointed out to her, some few months before her foundation, by another Carmelite nun, who had had the same inspiration with herself to found a reformed convent, and who had travelled barefooted to Rome to obtain the necessary permission. This was the celebrated Mary of Jesus, who became afterwards the foundress of a convent of the primitive rule at Alcala, and who fell in with Teresa at Toledo early in the year 1562. Her work never extended itself beyond a single convent. Teresa had at first no idea of doing more; and so strongly was she impressed with the evil of having a large number of inmates in the communities of her order, that she at first limited the members of her own to thirteen. As time went on, it was natural that many should present themselves as postulants for whom there was no room. She was also moved to aim at more than she had hitherto undertaken by other considerations. The favours with which God loaded her, and the joy and gratitude that filled her heart at the sight of the great perfection attained by the religious of her convent, made her burn with fresh desires to advance the glory of God. The state of the Catholic world, the inroads made upon it by heresy, and especially the threatening aspect of religious

affairs in France, filled her with grief and dismay; and the result of this conflict between her zeal for the Catholic faith and the sense of her own impotence to take any part in its defence, was the resolution, as she expresses it, at least as far as lay in her power, to make the friends of God, few as they were, as good as possible. But what could she do? Her convent had been founded, without the authority of the superiors of her own order, by an express brief from Rome, which did not contain any permission to extend the work beyond its walls: nor could she expect to find, in other cases, all the extraordinary helps and contingencies which had been necessary to enable her to surmount the opposition with which she had been met. Providence arranged the matter for her by bringing her into direct communication with the General of her order. Philip II. had a great desire for the reformation of the religious orders in his dominions, and one of his measures was to invite the General of the Carmelites to visit Spain for this purpose. The General, John Baptist Rossi, an excellent and fervent religious, entered warmly into the designs of the king, and, having obtained the leave of the Pope, reached Madrid, where he was received with great honour, in the summer of 1566. He was not very successful in the work which he immediately proposed to himself; but, as it so often happens, he laid the foundations of a far greater one, as it appeared, almost by an accident. He visited the two provinces of Andalusia and Castile, and made a number of excellent and much-needed regulations for reform, which, however, were rendered inoperative by the placid and tranquil obstinacy of the friars themselves. They made little open resistance, but they worked hard against him in secret, and at one time succeeded in prejudicing the mind of Philip himself strongly against him. But Rossi came to Avila in 1567 to hold the chapter of the province of Castile, and there he met with the real reformer of Mount Carmel. Teresa was not altogether without reasons for fearing his presence. The manner in which her convent had been founded; its having been placed under the jurisdiction of the bishop, instead of that of the superiors of the order; the return from the mitigated rule to primitive strictness, and her own presence there, though she was a professed nun of the convent of the Incarnation, might all seem to him to furnish reasonable ground for displeasure, and even for punishment. He might, at all events, order her to return to her original convent. All, however, turned out well, and the good bishop, to whom the letter on which we are commenting was addressed, helped very much to smooth all difficulties by ordering the new convent to receive the General as if he had

been himself. Rossi, like all who came to know Teresa, was charmed and even subdued by her conversation. Her force and earnestness of soul were sweetened by a simplicity, an openness, and a candour—especially when she was dealing with her superiors, to whom she delighted to lay bare her inmost thoughts—which nothing could withstand. Rossi promised her that he would not order her to leave the convent of S. Joseph, and rejoiced with all his heart to see the rule so strictly observed. He went much further than mere approbation. Much as she desired it, Teresa had not asked him anything with regard to the foundation of additional convents; but he gave her very ample powers for this purpose within the province of Castile. She had leave also to take to each new foundation two nuns from the convent of the Incarnation; their own consent was to be sufficient, and she was not to be interfered with in these measures by the local or provincial superiors. The new convents were to be under the immediate jurisdiction of the General himself, or of vicars or commissaries appointed by him. To these powers he afterwards added, at Teresa's request, that of founding two monasteries of Carmelite friars living under the same rule as the convents of women. At that time she was unable to point to a single friar of the order who was willing to embrace the Reform; but she saw that it was necessary for its preservation that some should be found.

This visit of Rossi inaugurates a new period in S. Teresa's life. He started her, in fact, on a new career. Strangely enough, we shall find him, before very long, endeavouring to undo the work begun under his own auspices! It is still more remarkable that he at this time secured to our Saint the protection which was finally to shield her and her Reform against his own persecution. He regained the favour of Philip II. before his departure from Spain. Passing through Madrid a few weeks after his visit to Avila, he spoke to the king in the highest terms of the prudence and sanctity of Teresa. From this time began the interest that Philip ever afterwards took in her and her religious children. He begged Rossi to commend himself and his kingdom in a special manner to their prayers. A few of Teresa's letters to Philip are extant,—unfortunately not the most important and interesting that she is known to have addressed to him.

From this date, 1567, for a space of seven or eight years, Teresa's life was one of almost continual activity, such, moreover, as must have entailed upon her a considerable amount of correspondence. The history of this period forms the greater part of what will ever be, to the general reader, her

most delightful work—*The Book of the Foundations*. She passed from place to place, leaving behind her fresh convents of the Reform of Mount Carmel as she went. Each of these foundations has its own providential history—few of them but cost her much anxiety and trouble, and brought out in more and more striking light her prudence and dexterity in the management of intricate negotiations. For the details of the story we must refer our readers to the bright and animated narrative of S. Teresa herself. As for her own part in these affairs, of which she speaks as little as possible, it is perhaps her courage as much as her prudence that strikes the attentive student. She made some mistakes at first as to the latter; but the former never failed. Her first foundation, at Medina del Campo, was one in which she and her sisters had a good deal to suffer at first, from what almost looks like precipitation in entering on a house nearly in ruins, and in starting from Avila with too large a number of religious before the foundation was well secured. In these matters Teresa gained by experience: she met with more obstacles than she had counted upon, and afterwards she learned always to expect them, and indeed to value them as presages of future good. She writes to a gentleman at Toledo about the foundation to be made there,—

As for giving money, that is nothing, and does no great harm. But if we were to see ourselves on the point of being stoned—you, and your son-in-law, and all of us who take part in this business, as was nearly happening to us at the time of the foundation of S. Joseph's at Avila—ah! then would be the time for good. If that happens now, I am persuaded that, far from losing by it, we should gain a great deal both for the new convent and for ourselves. (Tom. i. p. 109.)

Her courage, however, was always great. She was by nature timid and fearful; but, as is often the case with the Saints, she had gained a special gift of the virtue most opposed to her natural disposition.

The letters of this period are far more numerous than of any previous time, and they increase in number as the years pass on. Still we are afraid that we must suppose that the most considerable portion of her correspondence has not reached us. She founded the convent of Medina del Campo in 1567; those of Malagon and Valladolid in 1568; in 1569, those of Toledo and Pastrana. That at Salamanca was begun in 1570, that at Alba de Tormes—destined to be the scene of S. Teresa's death, and the resting-place of her relics—in 1571. After this an interval occurs in the foundations, during which S. Teresa was stationary at Avila, having been appointed Prioress of her original convent of the Incarnation in a manner

of which we shall speak presently. The next foundations were at Veas and Seville in 1575. Each of these convents must have given occasion to correspondence before its foundation; and when once established, there must have been a considerable amount of intercourse by letter between their Superiors and our Saint. These letters would refer to the external relations between the convents and ecclesiastical and religious Superiors,—to arrangements about their confessors,—to relations with founders and benefactors, sometimes not a little too exacting—to the reception of postulants, the profession of novices, and other matters of that character, as well as to a thousand little details of temporal business or spiritual advice. Strange to say, it is not till the year 1574 that we find among the extant letters a single specimen of this correspondence. The good Superiors of all the convents founded up to that time either took no care of Teresa's letters, or destroyed them at her request; unless, indeed, they cut them up as relics, in the manner mentioned above. Other correspondents of the Saint have preserved to us some valuable letters of this time. We will give extracts from one of these, which is quite a pattern letter of its class. It is to a lady—Doña Maria de Mendoza, sister of the Bishop of Avila, who undertook the jurisdiction of S. Teresa's first convent of S. Joseph. This lady, a great friend of the Saint, had founded a convent at Valladolid, and was now trying to force upon the religious community there a postulant who was considered by them unfit for their manner of life. Teresa begins—almost like an Englishwoman—about the weather:—

I have often thought of you during this very rigorous season. I have had fears that it might do you harm; and it seems as if my apprehensions had not been without foundation. Blessed be God, that we shall come by-and-by to eternity, which has no changes of weather! May it please His Divine Majesty that we may pass the time of this life in such a way as to merit the enjoyment of so great a blessing. As for me, the climate here has tried me so much, that it seemed as if this was no longer my birthplace.

She was at Avila, in charge of the convent of the Incarnation. She then goes on to speak of her own very weak health, of the great burthen she had to bear in the management of the convent, as well as of her own Reform, and of the happy change that has taken place in the religious among whom she is, mentioning, by the way, with gratitude, some alms sent by Doña Maria herself. She then approaches the main subject of her letter.

Now, in order that I may have every possible kind of suffering to endure, the prioress of your house at Valladolid writes to me to say that you, madam, are desirous to make them receive a religious, and that she hears that you are

annoyed with me because I have not been willing to admit her. She asks me to send her the permission for her reception, as well as for that of another postulant sent her by Fr. Ripalda. I have thought that the prioress has been deceived, and I should indeed be greatly pained if it were true that you had been vexed with me ; for, after all, you have the power to reprove me, and to command me as you wish. I cannot think that you have been angry with me without saying so—it must be, no doubt, that you have let people think you were so, simply in order to get out of a difficulty. If it were shown not to have been so, I should soon be consoled. With the Fathers of the Society I can very well manage matters ; and certainly they would never take a person unsuited to their order for the sake of pleasing me. But if you have made up your mind to bring about the reception of this person, I have nothing more to say. It is quite clear that you can command in this house, and in all our houses, and you may count on my obedience. I will send to ask for the authorisation of Father-Visitor or Father-General ; for it is contrary to our constitutions to admit a person with a defect of the kind under which your postulant labours. I have no power to dispense her : only one of these two Superiors can do it. In the meanwhile, let her learn to read Latin well, as no one can be received, according to our rule, without this.

Having thus yielded the point, she returns to the charge :—

In order to deliver my own conscience, and after having recommended the matter to our Lord, I cannot help telling you, madam, what I would do under similar circumstances. I speak, as I hinted before, on the supposition that you have not determined, whatever may happen, to force us to receive this person—for in that case, not to displease you, I submit to everything, and say no more. I beseech you only to reflect well on the matter, and to have a greater regard to the advantage of your house ; for when you come to see that it does not go on very well in every respect, you will be pained by it. In a convent where the number of religious is large, it is more easy to put up with defects. In yours, where there are so few subjects, it is necessary that all should be well chosen. I have always remarked that this was what you intended ; so convinced have I been of this, that though I have found subjects for all the other houses, I have never ventured to send any to yours, because I have not met with any one who united all the qualities that I desire to find in the religious of your convent. Thus it is that, in my judgment, neither of these two postulants ought to be received there. I do not see in them either sanctity enough, or strength of soul enough, or prudence enough, or talents enough, to make their admission of advantage to the house. If the house is to lose by them, why, I beseech you, do you wish them to be received ? There are other convents enough where they may be placed—where, as I said, the religious being numerous, certain defects are more easily tolerated. In yours, madam, every one who is received ought to be a person capable of being prioress, or filling any other office whatever.

For the love of our Lord, madam, reflect well upon this ; remember that we ought always to look to the common good rather than to that of individuals. Consider that your religious are in strict cloister, that they must pass their lives together, bear one another's defects, and endure besides all the

hardships of their rule. The greatest hardship they can have to endure is a mistake in the admission of a subject. Do then, madam, show favour to them in the present circumstances : add this new benefaction to all your other kindnesses. If you like, leave the affair to me ; as I have said, I will arrange it with the persons concerned. If, however, you persist in desiring the reception of this person, I say again, your orders shall be executed ; but if the consequences are disagreeable, the responsibility will be on you.

This letter is a specimen both of S. Teresa's manner of dealing with the most difficult circumstances, when a person towards whom she was under great obligations required a favour that it was against the interest of the convent to grant, and of the form in which such difficulties would often present themselves. Teresa did not always yield what was asked. One of the convents that gave her the greatest trouble in this respect was that of Pastrana, founded by the Prince and Princess of Eboli. They wished to establish, not only a convent of nuns, but a monastery of friars of the Reform, an object very dear at the time to Teresa's heart, as one alone had yet been founded. Nevertheless, she resisted strongly the desire of the Princess for the admission into the convent of a person who had left an Augustinian convent at Segovia after having made her vows there. The Princess at last yielded, influenced by the authority of Fr. Ybáñez, whom Teresa consulted. Teresa gave way on another matter—as to a foundation for the support of the religious ; but after a few years, the Prince being dead, the exactions and conditions insisted on by his widow became so insupportable, that Teresa removed the whole convent to Segovia.

Immediately before the letter from which we have just been quoting, we find, in P. Bouix's pages, a "speech" of S. Teresa, delivered to the nuns of the Convent of the Incarnation. The circumstances under which those few words were delivered were so remarkable, the words themselves so characteristic of the speaker, and the whole incident so closely connected with other events necessary to be known by any reader of S. Teresa's letters, that we shall say a few words on the subject in this place. We have already mentioned, that in the year 1571 S. Teresa was obliged to pause awhile in her work of founding new convents of the Reform, by a necessity imposed upon her of remaining at Avila for the space of between two and three years, in the office of Prioress of the convent just mentioned—the convent in which she had herself made her vows as a religious, and which was not, of course, included among those that followed the new rule. This necessity did not come, as it might appear at first sight, from any hostility

to the Reform. On the contrary, it was imposed upon her by superiors most anxious to further the work she had undertaken. Philip II. had not been at all satisfied with the results of the visit of the Carmelite General, of which we have already spoken. Rossi's reforms had fallen to the ground, from the simple reason that very few of his religious in Spain wished to see them carried out. "*Frustra equidem*," says one of the greatest Generals of another order, "*libri Regulis, Ordinationibus, et Visitationibus implentur, si desint animata instrumenta, quæ spiritum subministrent, et vividam illarum praxim exerceant*." The king, however, determined to try again, and, as the General had failed, he turned to the Pope. Pius V. appointed, at his request, two visitors for the Carmelites of Spain, both taken from the order of S. Dominic. Fr. Vargas was to visit Andalusia; Fr. Hernandez, Castile. The appointment was made in 1570: the powers committed to the visitors were very large. Hernandez, in his progress through the province of Castile, met with Teresa at Avila, in 1571. He was charmed and astonished, when, as was her wont with all superiors, she opened her conscience fully to him, and he immediately conceived for her the highest veneration. The unreformed, or "Mitigated" Carmelite nuns, existed at Avila side by side with those of the new Reform. The great Convent of the Incarnation—numbering more than 100 nuns—represented the first; the twelve or thirteen religious collected by Teresa in the little house of S. Joseph represented the second. No contrast could be more perfect. Regularity, strictness, poverty, charity, an entire seclusion from and forgetfulness of the world, the spirit of prayer and content and peace—crowned, in many instances, with very high supernatural favours and the closest union with God—such were the features that met the eye of the visitor in the quiet little cloister of S. Joseph's. The Convent of the Incarnation was in a miserable state. Large as was the number of its inmates,—though not so large as it had been some years before,—its revenues were small and totally insufficient, and great relaxation had consequently ensued. A large number of the nuns had begged leave to return to their families in order to escape starvation. The regular exercises of the community had been given up. The house was half full of young girls,—*pensionnaires*, as they would now be called, sent there to be brought up under the eye of the religious. The custom that prevailed of receiving frequent visits from secular persons, and even of returning them, and being absent for considerable parts of the year in this way, had been one of the abuses and distractions which had made S. Teresa long to leave

the convent, and take refuge in some place where she might observe her rule in peace. The visits of gentlemen of the city were permitted, and a good deal of scandal had arisen from the entire want of restriction or surveillance as to this dangerous licence. The religious were discontented, dissipated, fast losing their taste for their vocation altogether, and divided among themselves. Fr. Hernandez conceived the idea of remedying all these evils at once—not by forcing the religious of the Incarnation to adopt a new rule, but by putting at their head that daughter of their own house whose example and discretion had produced so very different a state of things within the walls of S. Joseph. He held a Chapter of the Friars of the Mitigation, and after taking the advice of the Definitors of the province, he appointed Teresa to the office of Prioress.

This step was not likely to be very palatable to the good ladies of the Incarnation. It was their ordinary right to elect their own head: so that, if they had had no objection at all to the person nominated, they would still have felt injured and insulted by the manner of nomination. Of course, the power of the Visitor could override all ordinary rights; but few sets of people are more tenacious of what they think they are entitled to than relaxed religious. They never mind breaking their rule in a thousand ways themselves, but they can never bear to hear of a legitimate authority interfering with their privileges. Besides, Teresa, notwithstanding the extreme sweetness and amiability of her character, could not but be unpopular among her former sisters. Relaxed religious, like persons of indifferent reputation, can bear anything rather than to be told what they are. S. Teresa had said little, but what she had done bore a fatal likeness to this unpardonable offence. She had left their convent to found another where a stricter rule was to be observed—what could that mean, but that they were not good enough for her? Moreover, the Reform presented itself under a new aspect, since the appointment of the Apostolical Visitors—respectable religious indeed, but, as the ladies of the Incarnation would say,—and many a reverend Carmelite Father of the Mitigation would applaud their discernment—they were members of another order, and what could they know about Mount Carmel? It was clear that they meant to change the rule; the new-fangled Reform was to be forced upon convent after convent; the absurd fancies that Teresa de Ahumada had introduced down at S. Joseph's were to be imposed as laws upon the house that had cherished her in its bosom for so many years of her life. The thing was quite clear—it had been intended long ago, and now she her-

self was thrust upon them to execute it. It was with the greatest repugnance that Teresa undertook the charge. But, in her prayer, our Lord bade her do it: and from that moment she submitted. After taking the precaution of solemnly renouncing the Mitigated Rule for herself, and of having her conventual rights transferred to the convent of Salamanca, she came to Avila, where, in the mean time, it had been resolved by her new subjects to call in the assistance of some gentlemen of their acquaintance to resist her entrance by force. She alighted, however, at the convent of S. Joseph; and, well aware of the state of things within the walls of the Incarnation, she used her authority, in the first instance, to secure from scandal the young ladies who were living as pupils in the convent. She sent an order for their removal—and in this she found herself obeyed. Hernandez had commissioned the Provincial, with another Father, to induct her into her office. They presented themselves, with Teresa, at the convent, and summoned the nuns to Chapter. The document appointing her Prioress was then read. The religious, like the inmates of a female penitentiary, fairly “broke out.” A large party protested with the utmost violence and fury against the act of the Visitor as arbitrary and illegal: they loaded Teresa and her companions with abuse, and when the Provincial began to threaten and reprimand them, they only became noisier and more outrageous. Another party, headed by a nun called Catharine de Castro, declared their willingness to accept Teresa, and set up the chant of *Te Deum laudamus*. They seized the Cross, and carried it before her into the choir, the whole community following; the tumultuous party, however, by no means desisting from their opposition. Teresa threw herself prostrate before the Blessed Sacrament, while the storm raged all around her. As it heightened, she rose from her knees, and went about in her winning way between the two contending parties, excusing each to the other, and laying the whole blame on her own unworthiness. It is said that on this occasion her touch restored many to consciousness who had fainted in the confusion and excitement: she attributed this effect to a large relic of the true Cross that she wore on her person. The opposition was quelled for the moment, but by no means extinguished; for many of the nuns felt that they had gone too far to expect any mercy if they did not succeed. The day came for holding a Chapter. A fresh outburst was expected, as it was thought that the new Prioress would exact a public reparation of the scandal, and would at once insist upon the abandonment of certain abuses—especially the unlimited use of the parlours. When the community entered

the lower choir, in which the Chapters were held, they saw an image of the Blessed Virgin in the place usually occupied by the Prioress. Teresa was quietly sitting on a low seat at the feet of our Lady. When all were assembled, she arose and addressed them :—

Ladies, my mothers, and my sisters,—

Our Lord, by means of the orders of my superiors, has sent me to this house, to fill in it the place of Prioress. I was quite as far from thinking of such an office as I am from deserving it. More than this, it has given me great pain to have to fill it, because I am unable to do so worthily ; because by my nomination you have been deprived of the power of electing a prioress to your own liking ; and because I am much more fit to imitate the least one among you than to be placed at your head. I come here only for one purpose, and that one I trust our Lord will give me grace to fulfil. It is to serve you and to comfort you to the utmost of my power. As for anything else, no one among you but is capable of giving me lessons in virtue and of correcting me of my faults. Tell me, then, what I can do for the good of each one among you. Were it needful to give my blood and my life for this, I would do so with all my heart.

I am a daughter of this house, and I am your sister. I know the character and the needs of all, or, at least, of the greater part of you. There is, therefore, no reason why you should regard as a stranger one who is your own by so many titles.

Do not take umbrage at my authority. It is true that I have lived for some years past among the Carmelites of the Reform, and that I have governed them ; but, by God's grace, I know how to deal with those who are not reformed. My only desire is that we should all serve our Lord with sweetness, and perform, for the love of that Adorable Master and out of gratitude for the great benefits with which He has loaded us, that little which is required of us by our Rule and our Constitutions. I know our weakness—it is great ; but if we do not in our deeds come up to all that our Lord asks of us, we will try to do so in our desires. He is merciful : He will certainly give us His grace, so that by degrees our actions may come to answer to our good will.

This speech of the new Prioress entirely won the hearts of her opponents ; nothing more was said against her, and she began at once with the utmost gentleness and prudence, though, at the same time, with perfect firmness, to reform the abuses of the convent. Alms began to flow in, for her presence attracted the assistance of the pious and the charitable. She was soon able to provide sufficiently for the temporal wants of the community, and especially for those whom she always considered as the precious jewels of a religious establishment,—the sick and the infirm. Her charity, sweetness, and cheerfulness spread like a charm over the house. In a short time the religious themselves brought her the keys

of the parlours and of the *tours*, begging her to commit them to whomsoever she would. In this way, by a little patience, she gained one of the great points on which she was bent, without any exercise of authority. She placed the keys in the hands of a prudent religious, in whom she had perfect confidence, and thus cut off entirely the great liberty of intercourse with secular persons which had caused so much dissipation. This measure was fiercely resented by some gentlemen of the town, who had been in the habit of paying too frequent and familiar visits to some of the nuns; one of them sent for Teresa, and abused her to her face, but was soon quelled by her simple dignity. Her government began in October, 1571, and by the following Lent she had gradually brought up the observance of piety and mortification in the house to such a point, that it was actually on a level with what was practised in the convents of the Reform. Early in 1572, she was able to secure the assistance of two friars of her Reform as the confessors of the convent; one of them no other than S. John of the Cross, as we have already mentioned. A perfect reformation was soon brought about by their united labours.

We have dwelt thus at length upon this incident, because it presents to the reader, more or less, all the elements of trouble and discord which at that time agitated the Carmelite Order, besides setting before him those great and rare qualities in S. Teresa which might have enabled her, if left to herself, or if trusted by those in power with the direction of affairs, to have calmed down the great tempest which was on the eve of bursting upon her religious family. Some knowledge of the particulars of the battle that had to be fought, first for the propagation, and afterwards for the very existence of her Reform, is quite necessary for the reader of the pages of P. Bouix. More than half the existing letters of S. Teresa belong to the period of this contest, which may be said to have broken out openly about 1574, and was only finally closed by the decision of the Holy See in 1579. Its history is somewhat intricate, nor has it ever been related in a perfectly satisfactory way. The letters before us are in the highest degree important with regard to this history. Many of them were not accessible to the early writers of the life of S. Teresa, and the author of the chronicle of the Order; and we may say with truth, that if the letters require the history as their commentary, the history is no less incomplete without the letters. Our business with it, however, must be confined to such points as chiefly illustrate the character and influence of S. Teresa herself.

When she began her work of founding fresh convents, she was quite unconscious either of the magnitude of her undertaking or of the storm that awaited her in its execution. She describes herself, in her sprightly way, "with no house, and no money to buy one—all the ways and means for this great undertaking consisted of a poor Barefooted Carmelite nun, laden with patents, full of good desires, and having no assistant but God alone." Still, her idea of the work, as it gradually unfolded itself, was free from many features and elements which eventually became sources of trouble and difficulty. Teresa had no intention of breaking up the Carmelite Order into two divisions; she had no desire to molest in any way those of her religious brethren and sisters who lived under the Mitigated rule, nor did she—until it was forced upon her by circumstances—desire for her own foundations any other government than that of the ordinary superiors. If matters had been left in her hands, she would gradually have spread over the provinces in which she was allowed to act, a network of convents and monasteries of the Reform, which would no doubt have been recruited continually by the voluntary accession of the more fervent religious belonging to the Mitigation, and might possibly in course of time have taken tranquil and universal possession for the primitive observance, by the gradual extinction of the more relaxed form of the rule of S. Albert. But it would have been quite against her wish, and quite foreign to her method of proceeding, as shown in the instance just given, to force the Reform upon a single individual or a single community. Her aim, therefore, was not so much to "reform" the existing members of the Order, as to plant by the side of the convents of the Mitigation her own institutions, asking for them simple toleration, and trusting to the gradual influence of example and prayer to bring over to them the others, if, indeed, she thought of their being brought over at all. Necessity would in any case, probably, have forced her in time to seek for the erection of her establishments into a separate province; but there her ambition would have stopped. Unfortunately, there were at the same time, as we have already seen, other reformers of Mount Carmel at work, proceeding on very different principles, and who insisted on using her and her religious children for their own purposes. Philip II., and even the General Rossi, wished to bring back the whole existing body of Carmelites to something like the rule which S. Teresa practised—not, it may be, exactly the same,—for she had added some constitutions of her own to the primitive rule; but at all events, to a far stricter régime than that which was actually in practice.

The Papal Nuncio, Nicolas Ormaneto, was devoted to the cause of reform in general, and seconded vigorously, with the full approbation of the Pope, the desires of the king with regard to the Carmelites. He had had some experience of the difficulties of the attempt of reform when, some years before, he had been vicar to S. Charles Borromeo in the diocese of Milan. The visitors appointed by the Pope at Philip's request were, it seems, very eminent men, and Hernandez at least seems to have discharged his difficult office with much prudence and considerateness. But it is obvious that the nature of his functions itself must have made him an object of suspicion and fear to the general body of the Carmelites, and to their ordinary Superiors in Spain, if not to the General in Italy. It was, therefore, a real hardship to impose on S. Teresa the task that he did, and it placed her at once in a delicate and difficult position. The jealousy with which the Visitor's measures were looked upon was at once reflected upon her. Up to this time, she had had no collision with the Carmelites of the Mitigation, though some dissatisfaction no doubt existed among them, from two causes,—the innate dislike that religious persons, not a whit less than others, feel for those who raise the troublesome question of a return to primitive observances; and also her exercise of the power, committed to her by the General, of taking a certain limited number of subjects for the new convents from among her old companions at that of the Incarnation. Now, however, notwithstanding all her prudence and gentleness, she became to some extent identified with the formidable attempt that was being made to reform the Carmelite Order by force and authority.

The measure taken by Fr. Hernandez was soon far more than imitated by Fr. Vargas, the Andalusian Visitor. He had, it appears, a more troublesome and recalcitrant set of friars to deal with than Fr. Hernandez. The character of the Andalusians seems to have been fierce and fiery; we find S. Teresa herself sometimes complaining that she can make little of them. Vargas determined to act on the same principle as Hernandez, and set the members of S. Teresa's Reform in authority over the others. But he had not any subjects in the Andalusian province whom he could thus employ. Rossi had at first empowered Teresa only to found convents and monasteries in Castile. It appears that at a later date he had enlarged her powers, at least, as regards convents, so as to include other parts of Spain; but she had, at all events, avoided acting on this extension. It was her principle to keep him well informed of what she did, and to act in everything

by his authority. There were in Castile a number of Carmelite students, belonging to the province of Andalusia, as it was their custom to make their theological course at the great university of Alcala. Some of these had even joined a new monastery of the Reform, founded at Altomira by the authority of Hernandez; others had met with friars of the new Observance at Alcala, and, as was natural, the more fervent among them desired to enter under a rule which had so much in it to attract the high-minded and heroic. Still, there was neither monastery nor convent of the Reform in Andalusia. Vargas attempted to get some friars from the new foundation of Altomira, but they were refused him. However, two of the fathers, by accident or design, paid a visit to Granada, and thus placed themselves, for the moment, under the obedience of Vargas. He detained them, and with the consent of Hernandez transferred them to his own province. He then proceeded to a step of some violence, which had afterwards to be retraced. He ejected the friars of the Mitigation from a monastery at San Juan á Porto, and placed in it the newcomers, who were soon joined by members of the Andalusian province who wished to pass to the new rule, as well as by novices from the world. This took place in 1571. Some time later, Fr. Balthasar of Jesus, to whom Hernandez had intrusted the foundation of the new monastery of Altomira, was sent into Andalusia under the pretext of attending to some affairs of the Prince of Eboli. Vargas fastened upon him, and made him his own vicar for carrying on the Reform. Other recruits came in in the same underhand way. At last the Andalusian Reform was joined by two men whose characters require a few words of description, as each of them had to play a conspicuous part in the troublous times that followed.

Ambrose Mariano of S. Benedict was one of those men of strong character and eventful career with whom we so frequently meet in the history of those days. Born at Bitonto, on the shores of the Adriatic, he had been a fellow-student of Ugo Buoncompagni, afterwards Gregory XIII. He distinguished himself greatly in mathematics, and gained, besides, the cap of doctor in theology and law. He was sent to the Council of Trent, and after its close was intrusted with important missions on ecclesiastical matters in Germany, Flanders, and elsewhere. Then he became a knight of the Order of S. John. He fought bravely in the battle of S. Quentin—on the Spanish side, and not less bravely after the victory, against one of his own comrades, in defence of the honour of two young maidens. On this he was falsely accused to Philip II., and for a time imprisoned, but soon set at liberty, and

honoured with the special confidence of the king. He soon, however, resolved on abandoning the world. A mission from the court took him to Cordova, where he made the Spiritual Exercises of S. Ignatius, and came forth from his retreat, as so many others have done, with his mind bent on renouncing all for the Cross. He fell in with a community of hermits, and lived among them for fourteen years. In 1569, S. Teresa had met with him at Madrid, and, showing him the rule of S. Albert, had won him over to her Reform. He became at once one of its principal supports. He was still a layman when, at the time of which we are speaking, Fr. Balthasar of Jesus invited him to come to Andalusia, and join in the good work there. He accepted the invitation with joy, and determined to bring with him another, destined to play a more conspicuous part than himself in the work of the Reform. He went to the Provincial, and asked leave to visit Andalusia "on private business." Leave was granted him, and on his representation that he must have a companion, he was told, at his own request, that he might take his own choice. Without a word more, he took with him a young, but already very eminent religious, whose name occurs perhaps oftener than any other in the letters of S. Teresa, Fr. Jerome Gracian, of the Mother of God.

This celebrated man was the son of Diego Gracian, who had been secretary successively to Charles V. and Philip I., and had been justly considered one of the ablest as well as one of the most upright men of that stormy time. His piety was as great as his abilities and his integrity. All the members of his large family, and especially his son Jerome, seem to have inherited the fine qualities of their father. Jerome had studied theology with great success at Madrid and Alcalá. His studies completed, he received the priesthood, and at once acquired a great reputation as a preacher and a theologian. As his father's memory was held in great veneration and honour, and as his brother had succeeded to the important post of secretary at the court, Jerome appeared to have marked out for him a great career in the Church. But he had already determined on leaving all, and entering religion. A chance, as it seemed, brought him to the Carmelite convent at Pastrana to solicit the habit for a lady of his acquaintance. The Prioress, as S. Teresa tells us, was so charmed with his conversation, that she immediately began to pray with great fervour that his vocation might be to the Reform of Mount Carmel. Gracian visited the monastery at Pastrana as well as the convent, and was in his turn so charmed by the fervour and austerity of the friars, that he begged for himself

the favour he had come to seek for another. S. Teresa has left us a beautiful description of his humility and patience during his noviciate. She always speaks of him with an enthusiasm and a warmth of attachment that she hardly displays with regard to anyone else. He seemed to her a person providentially sent her to accomplish the work she had commenced: he became also her spiritual guide, under a special vow of obedience, during the later years of her life. He was, and delighted to call himself, her "cherished son;" and when the persecution against them both forced her to use feigned names in her correspondence, she chose for him those of *Paul* and *Eliseus*. Here and there we find her remonstrating with him in the gentlest manner for little defects, which after her death helped to bring upon him a great storm of persecution, which, however, was chiefly caused by his firmness in maintaining principles that she had taught him. There is at times a mournful tenderness in her letters to him, as if she had some kind of presentiment that his future path was to be one of the most extraordinary suffering.

The characters of these two men had, as we have hinted, a great influence on the course of events subsequent to their appearance in Andalusia. They seemed to have been naturally intended to balance one another; but unfortunately, in an undertaking that required even more tact, prudence, and patience than S. Teresa had shown in her management of the convent at Avila, the scale sometimes inclined to an excess of rigour, sometimes to too great indulgence and concession. Ambrose Mariano was, as might have been expected from his history, a man of fiery temper, uncompromising, never averse to an open rupture, strong in his measures, and still stronger in his language. Jerome Gracian had the sweetest and gentlest manners, the knack of winning hearts almost at once, of ruling in the main firmly, though considerately, and of condescending to humour infirmities without sacrificing principles. But at times, under the very difficult circumstances in which he found himself, he lacked decision and courage. S. Teresa tells him in one of her letters that he was never made to move in affairs as to which there was a doubt which of two paths was the right one. He hesitated and wavered at the moments of greatest need. Thus, in the last year of this anxious contest, he brought the cause of the Reform to within an inch of destruction by his want of resolution, and then, as is often the case with the weak, he rushed into the opposite extreme, and put himself and the whole body of Reformed friars completely into the hands of their enemies by an act of the most inexcusable rashness. In both

instances he acted directly against the urgent advice of S. Teresa.

When Ambrose Mariano, who had been obliged to wait some weeks in Madrid by the receipt of a letter from the General, bidding him receive sacred orders, arrived in Andalusia with Jerome Gracian, the latter was not yet thirty years old, and had not of course been more than a very few years in the Carmelite Order. Notwithstanding this, Vargas at once made him his own vicar for the purposes of reform, in the place of Balthasar of Jesus, and added the powers of Visitor of the Carmelites of Andalusia. It was, probably, an extremely imprudent step to set so young a religious in so difficult a position. Gracian's first steps were very judicious and conciliatory: he restored to the Mitigated Carmelites the monastery that had been taken from them, and sent back to them several subjects who had joined the Reform. He then went with Ambrose to Seville, and took up his quarters in the monastery belonging to the Mitigation, having as yet none of his own. But all his prudence could not prevent the outbreak of dissatisfaction and complaint; and it seems that the friars of the Mitigation already knew that the measures of Vargas had been so represented to the General at Rome as to prejudice him strongly against the Reform. An open rupture took place when Gracian at length accepted a house in which to found a community of the new rule. An attempt was made to stop it by the authority of the king; but Philip was already secured by Vargas, and the discontented friars could only betake themselves afresh to Rome for assistance. This took place in 1574.

The Andalusian quarrel had now fairly begun, and the members of S. Teresa's Reform, by being put in posts of extraordinary authority over their unreformed brethren, had been brought into distinct and open collision with them. We must shortly mention how it came to pass that she herself was involved in the dispute. She found herself at Veas in 1575, for the foundation of a convent, under the powers committed to her by the General. Veas was a town on the Castilian side of the frontier, and she had supposed it to belong to the province of Castile. She had even made inquiries, to prevent any mistake, but she had been misinformed: the town really belonged to Andalusia, as some parts of our English counties are found insulated in the midst of others. But this was not discovered till the foundation had been made. Here, too, she fell in, for the first time, with Fr. Jerome Gracian, and her letters at this time are full of the joy and thankfulness she felt on finding her Reform enriched with a person of such rare

qualities. Gracian, at that time her superior, in his quality of Vicar for Andalusia, insisted on her making a foundation at Seville. She objected and resisted, but at length yielded, out of obedience. Perhaps also she foresaw the violence of the storm that had already begun, and wished to exert herself to the utmost in the cause of peace. She went to Seville, and, after a great many difficulties and troubles, was able to found a convent, which during the distressing times that ensued, was exposed to a very large share of persecution and calumny. But this step served to identify her, in the minds of Rossi and the chiefs of the Order in Italy, with the seemingly arbitrary and irregular measures of Vargas and his subordinates. There was no longer any hope left of the peaceful progress of the Reform. It could not now make its own way without coming into conflict with the already existing body of Carmelites. Its leaders were for the time in power, but their position was precarious and exceptional. They had irritated against themselves, not only the dull, inert, obstinate mass of the ordinary religious, whose quiet and comfortable lives they had ruffled by the distasteful prospect of a return to primitive observance, and that too, as it were, at the point of the sword; but the more respectable men who made up the number of ordinary Superiors, who found their own authority interfered with and set aside by Vicars and Visitors. The mischief of this state of things was, that not only were Gracian and his assailants very unlikely to do much good to the unwilling subjects whom for the time they ruled by force, but they laid themselves open to the most vindictive retribution whenever the government of the two provinces of Castile and Andalusia was restored to its ordinary possessors. And all this time the Reform had no regular government of its own distinct from the rest of the Order: its own existence was in no way secured to it; its convents, monasteries, and constitutions might be swept away by a word from a hostile General. From this date, then, we find S. Teresa labouring—and, in reality, labouring almost alone—for the one measure that could now rescue the religious families, of which she had been the mother, from molestation and destruction—the erection of the Reform into a separate province, governed by its own members, under the authority of the General.

It was high time to think of some measures of precaution. While Gracian and Ambrose were settling matters for themselves in Andalusia, blows were being aimed at them in Italy which seemed likely at once to destroy their whole power. In August, 1574, Rossi obtained from the Pope the revocation of the appointment of the Apostolical Visitors. He did not,

however, use the letters which gave him that advantage at once, probably out of fear of Philip II. During his delay, the fact became known in Spain. Ormaneto, the Nuncio, who had received very large powers for the reform of religious orders, which were not withdrawn by the letters in question, immediately confirmed Vargas in his appointment, and joined with him *in solidum* Fr. Jerome Gracian. The Pope, when consulted, did not disapprove of this measure. The blow, then, was averted for the present; but it was soon to be followed by another.

This came from the General Chapter of the Carmelite Order, which was held under Rossi's presidency at Piacenza, in Italy, in the spring of 1575. It passed a decree, ordering the dissolution of all the monasteries of the Reform in Andalusia, and all that had been founded in Castile without the leave of the General. They took no notice, indeed, of the Apostolical Visitors: but this decree reversed what they had done for the Reform. Moreover, the General appointed a Visitor on his own authority, whose ostensible office was to carry out the decree of the Chapter. The person selected was a Portuguese Carmelite, by name Jerome Tostado. It is almost amusing to see the terror that this appointment inspired among S. Teresa and her friends. They believed that he had secret instructions which went far beyond the professed object of his visit. Philip II. was known to favour the Reform, and it was therefore not politic, and perhaps not possible, for its enemies to attempt its open destruction. The decree of the Chapter left untouched the work that Teresa had done under the General's sanction. But it was supposed that, as far at least as the monasteries of men were concerned, Tostado was in fact to suppress them. This was not to be done openly. The King was to be complimented in the name of the General, and thanked for his great zeal for the benefit of the Order. Tostado was to explain that his instructions enjoined upon him to make a great deal of the Reformed friars. They were to be put in places of authority in various monasteries throughout the province; while their own convents were to be recruited by a number of subjects from the Mitigation, who would, it was hoped, learn much from the edifying example and austere regularity of their brethren. Thus, in fact, the Reformed body was to be fused with the Mitigation; and, in the process of fusion, swallowed up. Finally, another decree of the Chapter of Piacenza was aimed at Teresa personally. She was not to travel about any more for the purpose of making new foundations: she was to choose one of her convents, and remain there, without leaving it under any pretext whatever.

This last measure, which S. Teresa felt very keenly, as implying that she had disobeyed the General, and as putting a stop to her work of foundations, was the only one of those concocted at Piacenza which was carried into execution. S. Teresa's letters to Rossi at this time, speaking very quietly and humbly about her own disgrace, but exerting all her influence and power of reasoning in defence of Ambrose Mariano and Jerome Gracian, of whose proceedings, however, she did not altogether approve, are among the noblest relics of her pen that we possess. They are far too long for quotation. She remained at Seville till the summer of 1576, as the order of the Chapter reached her at the beginning of winter, when travelling would have been dangerous in her then state of health. After the winter she was detained by Fr. Jerome Gracian, who still retained his authority, and only reached Toledo, the place of her imprisonment, at the time we have named. The other decree was not carried out, in consequence of the determined attitude of Ormaneto and Philip. When the terrible Tostado came at last to Spain, he was baffled by the royal authority and that of the Nuncio; and although, after the death of the latter, he was able to cause a great deal of annoyance to the Reform, he was at last obliged to return to Italy without having accomplished his mission. As long as Ormaneto lived, the Reform was safe from present danger, and even triumphant over its enemies. In the autumn of the same year in which the Chapter of Piacenza was held, he appointed Gracian Superior of all the Discalced Carmelites in Castile and Andalusia, and Visitor of the Carmelites of the Mitigation (or "Observance") in the latter province. This put him in the possession of plenary powers, and he was able a second time to reduce the refractory Andalusians to his obedience. But his successes were those of a general who uses his only army to make a raid into the enemy's country, while his own base of operations is unsecured, and his own capital left undefended. In vain S. Teresa urged again and again the mission of deputies to Rome, to obtain the only concession that could make the Reform secure,—its erection into a separate province. It seems as if Ormaneto, at all events, understood the necessity of this measure, and early in the summer of 1577 he was preparing to carry it out, though such a change could hardly be validly made without the General or the Pope. But he had not time to accomplish his design. Months before this, in one of her letters to Gracian, urging the mission to Rome, Teresa had told him of an intimation that had been received in prayer by a pious person of her acquaintance, of the approaching death of the

Nuncio. Her wishes for his preservation are quaintly expressed in the name that he bears among the fictitious titles used in her correspondence—that of *Mathusala*. On the 28th of May she wrote thus to Seville:—"Once more I say, now is the time at which the Order needs the prayers of all. My daughters, do not lose sight of these great interests; for, with God's grace, we shall soon see a favourable issue, or, if not that, the ruin of our hopes. Never was prayer so needful as now." Before her letter reached its destination, Ormaneto was dead. His successor, Philip Sega, Bishop of Ripatransone, a relation of the Pope, had been strongly prepossessed against the Reform before leaving Italy, by the General and the Cardinal Protector of the Order, and came into Spain determined to destroy it.

Sega's appointment inaugurates what may be called the last campaign in the war of the Carmelite Reform—a campaign full of the most disastrous defeats for S. Teresa and her friends. Her letters of this time, all written from her "prison" at Toledo, reflect faithfully these successive calamities. First, there is a doubt whether Gracian's powers are not at once extinguished by the death of Ormaneto: the king orders theologians to be consulted, who decide that, as the work is not finished, the commission remains in force. But Gracian himself hesitates to use his authority, and alienates his only protectors, the king and his council, by his timidity and indecision. Then he is calumniously charged with unbecoming conduct at Seville in his intercourse with the nuns. Teresa writes to Philip, full of indignation, that the fullest inquiry may be made; and the accusers—two of the Reformed friars—retract. Then Tostado again appears, ordering the Reformed Carmelites to obey those of the Mitigation wherever convents of both exist. A great deal of trouble and perplexity is the result, as Gracian, to whom they look as their superior, will not act with any vigour. But the king interdicts Tostado from using his powers in Spain, and that troublesome personage betakes himself to Italy. Before he goes, however, we have another storm raised by him, about which Teresa must exert herself. A vacancy occurs in the office of Prioress in the Convent of the Incarnation, and her old friends, the majority of the convent, as we have already said, wish to elect her. Tostado sends the Provincial to hold the election, threatening with excommunication any one who votes for her. She is elected nevertheless, though another candidate is imposed on the convent, and her supporters are accordingly excluded from the choir and denied the Sacraments. Again she writes to the king. The royal council decides that the excommunication must be taken off; but Sega, who now appears on the scene,

takes care that it shall be done in the most vexatious manner possible, and orders the abduction and imprisonment of S. John of the Cross and the other confessors of the convent. Teresa again appeals to the king, but S. John's place of imprisonment is so carefully concealed, that justice cannot be done. Meanwhile, a vigorous attack made by Segá on Gracian brings into full light the weakness of the latter. We have mentioned his hesitation to use his powers conferred by Ormaneto, after that nuncio's death. Segá had not, as yet, exhibited any faculties empowering him to interfere with the affairs of the Carmelites; and it was not therefore necessary to obey him. Indeed, S. Teresa tells us that he had protested he did not mean to interfere with Gracian. Suddenly he issued an order for the Provincials of the Observance to act as visitors for the religious of the Reform. Gracian, Ambrose Mariano, and other leading fathers, were at Pastrana at the time. They were summoned at once to submit to the Nuncio's authority. Although armed with letters from the king, which were sufficient to shield him from molestation, Gracian, after holding a council of war, like a defeated general, gave way, and surrendered all the powers he had received from Ormaneto to the representatives of Segá. Things seem to be as bad as they can be, for Segá is by no means appeased by this tardy submission. But soon we are made to see that they *can* be worse. To surrender at discretion was at all events justifiable on the ground of a scrupulous reverence for the authority of the Nuncio. To brave that authority after having submitted to it, could only be a mark of the most foolish rashness. Yet Gracian did this—like the Spanish troops at Rocroi, who after having asked for quarter, fired upon Condé as he advanced to receive their *parole*, and thus goaded their French conquerors almost to madness—he caused a Chapter of the Reformed friars to be summoned at Almodovar, which, on no authority but its own, erected the Reform into a separate province, elected a Provincial, and chose deputies to proceed to Rome. This measure was opposed, not only by the letters of S. Teresa, but by the remonstrances of S. John of the Cross, who was marvellously delivered from his prison just at this time. All in vain. But, as if to put a fitting crown to the whole absurdity, Gracian and his colleagues, after having done all this in defiance of the Nuncio, sent the acts of the Chapter to him for confirmation. He immediately annulled the whole, confined the ringleaders, as contumacious rebels, in separate convents, and vented his wrath not on them only, but on the two saints who had exerted themselves so much to prevent what had been done.

The news of this Chapter almost breaks down S. Teresa's courage. Up to this time she has been the support and guide of all around her—cheerful, hopeful, courageous, prudent, forecasting all difficulties and instinctively divining the remedies for all evils. Her letters deserve to be studied deeply, as models of practical sagacity, patience, and constant courage. But now her heart seems to fail, and for a whole day she will eat nothing. Our Lord appears to her, with bread in His hand, and consoles her: "Eat, my daughter, for I see well how much you suffer; but take courage, for it must be thus." The next day she begins again to exert herself to gain friends and protectors, and writes to the king letters that move him far more than any of the representations made to him by the intercession she obtains. We know this only from her biographers, for these letters have unfortunately been lost. Still, however, Philip does not move—he has been much displeased with Gracian for not resisting the Nuncio, and declining to rest on his royal protection. Meanwhile, all kinds of vexation and persecution fall upon the convents and monasteries of the Reform. At last, towards the end of 1578, comes a more stinging blow than any Teresa has yet had to bear. Her character, at all events, has hitherto been spared. Fresh calumnies against Gracian and the nuns of Seville are spread abroad by an imprudent confessor, piqued with the Prioress for having stopped some unnecessary interviews between himself and two of her religious. The Prioress is deposed, the nuns are in daily expectation of a visit from the officers of the Inquisition—Teresa herself is involved in the charge. "If they must lie," she cries, "let them do it in such a way that no one will believe them!" Again she is all activity, consoling the nuns with letters, which they, happily, did not burn or cut to pieces, and urging on the investigation of the charges before the Royal Council. It took some time to bring the matter to an end; but at length the accusations were completely refuted, and the Prioress—a great friend to us, for she kept the letters she received from Teresa—was reinstated in her office.

The year 1579 opens with the darkest prospects for the Reform; its leading members are in prison, its convents and monasteries forced to obey the Superiors of the Mitigation; nothing more remains for its destruction but to suppress their separate existence altogether. Every one has lost heart, except Teresa and her faithful assistant, Anne of Jesus, the prioress of Veas. In March, Ambrose Mariano, and another father, write to her from Madrid, announcing the final blow. The Nuncio has determined, at the request of Rossi, not only that

no more monasteries are to be founded, but that those in existence shall be dissolved. The decree has been definitively made, and Segá is, moreover, seriously irritated against herself. Fortunately we possess her answer to both letters. She writes thus to Father Mariano :—

Now that I see the world and hell in arms against my children, I am so certain that our Lord and my Father S. Joseph are about to take up this cause, that from this very day, my dear Father, you may consider yourself conqueror instead of vanquished. Lucifer desires nothing more than to see this little flock of our Lady dispersed and destroyed. It will not be as he thinks—on the contrary, my dear son, our very persecutors will declare themselves in our favour. Let your tears be changed into gladness. As for me, that which pierces my heart is this : that my children should have to suffer, to live in dispersion and persecution as they do, on account of a sinner such as I am. This it is that makes me weep and groan. But for the rest—I, for one, hold our victory as certain, seeing that the cause we fight for is the cause of God.

She goes on with the utmost calmness to tell him what steps to take in the present emergency. She sends him a letter to be delivered to the king, and a second for the Nuncio. This last is not to be handed to him until the king has had time to speak to him after receiving his own. The date of her letter is the Annunciation, 1579.

The letter to the other father, John of Jesus, of the same date, adds something to our knowledge as to the reason of her marvellous confidence. Under the strictest secrecy, she tells him that a religious in the convent from which she writes—she means herself—had been favoured with a vision on the eve of S. Joseph's feast. Our Lord had appeared to her, accompanied by His mother and her holy spouse. Both were interceding for the Reform. Our Lord had told the religious that both in hell and on earth there were at that time great rejoicings on account of its approaching destruction ; but that at the moment when the Nuncio had decreed its dissolution below, its confirmation had been ordained in heaven. She and her friends were to address themselves to the king, who would be a father to them in everything. Our Lady and S. Joseph spoke to her to the same purpose, and added many other things that she could not write : among the rest she was told that within twenty days she herself would be set free from her imprisonment.

Boucher and other historians of S. Teresa's life have related at length how the wonderful change came about which the Saint thus predicted. A complaint of Segá, who had felt insulted by some angry expressions of the Conde de

Tendilla, a partisan of the Reform, gave Philip an occasion to hint to the Nuncio that he disapproved of his severity against religious of so much reputation for virtue and sanctity. Tendilla appeared soon after this to make his apology, and found the Nuncio ready to listen to his remonstrances and arguments. The conference ended by Segá's proposing that the king should appoint a commission to assist him in settling the whole business. The persons appointed were men of great eminence, some of them well acquainted with Teresa. In consequence of their advice, the Reform was at once exempted from the jurisdiction of the Observance, and placed under a superior of its own, who, though not himself a Reformed friar, was kindly disposed to Teresa and her children. He at once liberated Teresa—within the twenty days. In the summer the commission made its report in four heads:—1. That the Reform should be preserved. 2. That the Discalced Carmelites were not to live in the same houses with those of the Observance. 3. They were to have priors taken from their own body. 4. Philip was to be asked to use his influence at Rome to procure the erection of the Reform into a separate province. This last measure, the great object of S. Teresa's exertions for so long a time, required a very delicate and tedious negotiation; but it was at last obtained, and the separate province erected in the spring of 1581.

The conclusion of this long contest carries us almost to the year of S. Teresa's death. She lived on till October, 1582. Her activity as a letter-writer continued to the last, and a large number of the letters that remain belong to the last year of her life. We may mention, as particularly interesting, on account of the proofs they give of her practical wisdom and moderation, a series of letters written in the latter half of February, 1581, to Father Gracian. He was at Alcala de Henares, where the Chapter was being held for the separation of the Reformed province. The letters contain her recommendations on various points which were to be inserted in the constitutions of the new institute. S. Teresa is always in favour of simplicity, and of what will secure the recollection of her religious without burthening too much their liberty, or interfering with their cheerfulness. She objects to changes and variations in the office, and to imposing too rigorous a mode of fasting beyond the requirements of the Church. Years before this time (in 1576), she had written to Father Gracian, after a visitation made by another father in a convent, where he had left behind him an enormous number of regulations: "This is just what my religious fear. They fear to see certain hard and austere superiors come to them and put

over them a yoke heavy enough to discourage them, and make them sink under its weight. Strange! some people never think they have visited a convent unless they have made a heap of regulations." This good visitor had ordered the nuns to have no recreation on days of Communion. S. Teresa has no patience with him. "If it is true that we ought not to have recreation on days of Communion, and yet priests say mass every day, is it not obvious that they must never take recreation at all? And if they are dispensed from such a law, is it just to make others keep it who are much younger, and so have much more need of relaxation?" She stands out firmly on the point of proper and abundant nourishment. The priors of the monasteries had hitherto failed to provide this. "I declare," she says, "that if some remedy is not applied to this abuse in all their houses, we shall see the consequences. The fathers of the Chapter ought not to forget to enjoin on the priors by precept to give their religious proper nourishment. God will never fail to give what is necessary: if they give little to their religious, He will give little to them." She is equally energetic against dirt. "*For the love of God*, let your Paternity neglect nothing in order to make cleanliness prevail in the beds and table-linen of the religious, whatever expense may be necessary for it: *car c'est une chose terrible que la malpropreté*. Decidedly, I should wish that this point were ordered by a constitution; and I even think that that will not be enough for them, being what they are." The great point on which she insists for her nuns is that they are not in any case to have their Superiors as confessors. For the same reason, she will not have them subject to the priors of the monasteries of their own order. "The greatest good that the fathers of the Chapter can do to our nuns is to establish that the only relation their confessors have with them shall be to hear their sins in confession, and that, besides that, they have no intercourse with them at all. Our whole future existence depends on this care to get rid of the occasion, in order that there may not be found among the confessors of our nuns *ces noirs dévots destructeurs des épouses de Jésus-Christ* . . . The infraction of this law, and the reception of too large a number of religious, are the two things of which I have always been afraid as likely to do us most harm."

We ought not to close our article without saying a word about S. Teresa's relations with her own family. She was by no means one of those saints who threw all their letters from home into the fire. She entered religion in a convent near her own home, and she always kept up a close intercourse with her father during his lifetime, and afterwards with her

brothers, sisters, and their children. As she advanced in sanctity herself, she became their guide and adviser, and had the happiness to see them singularly distinguished for virtue and piety. Several of her near relations became either Carmelite nuns, or members of other religious orders. Her youngest sister, Jane of Ahumada, was brought up under her eye in the Convent of the Incarnation, as were also two of her nieces, Mary and Eleanor of Ocampo, both of whom died Carmelites, with the reputation of high sanctity. Jane of Ahumada married, and one of S. Teresa's earliest miracles was wrought in favour of one of her children. Her daughter Beatrice grew up devout and pious: but, as she was passing from youth into womanhood, she became vain and fond of company, and seemed to have a dislike to the notion of entering religion. We have some letters of S. Teresa about her, which show our Saint's extreme dislike to anything like over-freedom with girls of her age. Certain malicious persons had set some gossip afoot against her on account, as it appears, of the unguarded intercourse she allowed herself with some family friends. Teresa writes to defend her niece's reputation, but, at the same time, she is very urgent in trying to put a stop to the occasion of the scandals. She seems to have known that Beatrice would soon come round. "Do what you like," she said to her, "you will be a Barefooted Carmelites some day." Beatrice gained her vocation while praying, after her aunt's death, before her grave at Alba. She entered the convent there, and died with the reputation of a saint. But the members of S. Teresa's family of whom we hear the most in her letters, are her brother Laurence de Cepeda and his daughter Teresa. It was a sum of money sent by Laurence from America that enabled his sister to found her first convent. He returned from the New World a widower, with his two children, about the time of Teresa's foundation at Seville; and, after some time, settled near Avila, leading a very holy and penitential life under her direction. Many of her letters to him exist. His daughter, named after her aunt, but often called Teresita in her letters, was the favourite child of our Saint. She lived many months in the convent at Seville while Teresa was there; and was afterwards brought up in S. Joseph's at Avila. In the letters of the most troublous period of S. Teresa's life her name is continually meeting us, and we see with what tender affection, amid all her distractions, the heart of the aunt rested on the niece. First, she is the child of seven, amusing the good nuns of Seville at their recreation by her lively stories of the Indians and of her Atlantic voyage. By-and-by, the letters to Seville mention her: her

goodness, her docility, and the edification she has given by her conduct on her journey with her aunt. "Teresa says she can't write to you ; she is so busy ; she is prioress now, and sends you her respects" (tom. ii. p. 424). Then we are told how she is quite like a religious at Avila, surprising the whole convent by her humility, obedience, love of prayer, and exactitude. She already burned with the desire to consecrate herself to God. Soon she begs her aunt to send her a discipline—"very severe," she begs it may be. Then we have the tender message, "Tell Teresa not to fear that I love any one as much as herself." She was admitted as a novice at thirteen, and professed the year after ; but her aunt was not there to receive her vows ; she was on the road to Avila for the purpose, when obedience turned her last steps to Alba de Tormes. There she fell ill and died, before Teresita made her vows. Thus the last of our Saint's sacrifices was to give up one of the joys dearest to a heart like hers—the witnessing the consecration to God of the child of so much prayer and love, whom she had trained up with the tenderest care, and who was a part of herself by the triple title of kindred, affection, and spiritual relationship. Laurence de Cepeda, the father of Teresita, had preceded his saintly sister to the grave. Her niece, thus doubly an orphan, began her life as a professed nun while the sense of her great bereavement was still fresh upon her heart. She took her aunt's name in religion, and closed a peaceful cloister life at the age of forty-two by a death adorned by all the marks of eminent sanctity. She had no great work in the Church to accomplish, no wonderful writings to leave behind her for the guidance and comfort of interior souls ; but her purity, sweetness, simplicity, and charity handed on to another generation of her order the image of the Saint of whom she had been the darling child ; and her name shines among the glories of Mount Carmel with a modest brightness of its own, that is not entirely eclipsed even by the surpassing splendour of that of the first and most celebrated Teresa of Jesus.

ART. VI.—THE DOGMATIC PRINCIPLE.

Undogmatic Christianity. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, May 3, 1863, by the Rev. Walter Waddington Shirley, M.A. London and Oxford: Parker.

The Unity of Evangelical and Apostolical Teaching. Sermons preached mostly in Canterbury Cathedral. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. Murray. 1859.

A CATHOLIC who observes present phenomena with any kind of attention will be well aware that by far the most formidable obstacle which the Church now encounters among the educated classes, is not their dislike of this or that particular doctrine, but of the dogmatic principle itself. Our controversialists as yet seem not sufficiently alive to this circumstance; at all events we are not ourselves acquainted with any treatise directed expressly to the question. It is a question which could not be treated as a whole at all satisfactorily, unless a large volume were devoted to its methodical consideration; and since we have only a few pages at command, we must, if we handle the theme at all, do so in a merely fragmentary way. The dialogue therefore which follows, so far from pretending to exhaust the subject, must be understood as being no more than a superficial preface to a deeper and wider disquisition.

We have prefixed to this article the title of a Protestant sermon, which serves to show that not in the Establishment, any more than in the Catholic Church, have controversial writers as yet sufficiently addressed themselves to this most critical and vital topic. "Let us at once acknowledge," says Mr. Shirley, "that the chief controversy which lies before this generation does not relate to the results of criticism and science, nor even to any single point of doctrine, but to the value and estimation of dogmatic theology as a whole; and we shall not beat the air with uncertain efforts; we shall know against what and for what we have to contend" (p. 12). Nor are we at all the less willing to quote this most important remark because it comes from a Protestant clergyman. Far be it from us to disparage or sneer at any expression of good principle coming from such a quarter, because of the inconsistent mass of opinions with which it may be mixed up. On the contrary, we may reasonably hope, in the case of any given individual, that by developing that portion of truth

which he holds, he may work himself free from error, and seek the full and pure Gospel where alone it can be found—from the living voice of the Catholic Church. Of Mr. Shirley we know absolutely nothing beyond the fact of his having preached and published this sermon. But we see nothing whatever in the sermon itself with which every good Catholic will not heartily sympathize; unless indeed one passage, which follows very soon after that just quoted, must be regarded as an implied protest against “Roman corruptions:” a sense, however, which it does not bear on the surface, and which, we are willing to hope, was not intended by the writer.

For ourselves, as we have already said, we shall not attempt to treat the question except in a fragmentary way, and under one of its very numerous aspects. Nor can we better explain the position which we would assume, than by a supposed dialogue between Catholic and Liberal. We would only premise that the dialogue must be understood entirely as philosophical and not as dramatic. In other words, we are but seeking to explain by it our own convictions as to the true value of the various arguments adduced; and are far from imagining that a real living liberal would be converted, by any such summary process, from the error of his ways.

Liberal.—My own objection to you Catholics is not at all that you hold this or that particular doctrine. You are very welcome to believe in Transubstantiation, if you will only allow me an equal liberty of disbelieving it. Perhaps your reason for believing it is that your father so taught you; and mine for disbelieving it that *my* father so taught *me*. If so, how can it be laudable for you to believe your father, but censurable for me to believe mine? Or perhaps the reason of our difference is that you are convinced by the evidence adduced to prove God’s revelation of the doctrine, and that I am not convinced by that evidence. But if so, how can the mere appreciation of evidence be a matter of praise or blame? I have no more power to make my appreciation of evidence different from what it is, than I have to change the colour of my hair or the cubits of my stature. And, at last, what really pleases God is, not accuracy of speculative opinion, but a virtuous and conscientious life. In my part of the country there are two great landed proprietors, one a Catholic, and the other a Unitarian. I know a good deal about both of them: I find them equally just, honourable, and benevolent in dealing with their tenants, their dependents, and all their fellow-men; I follow them into private life, and find them equally blameless in all their domestic relations.

Am I then to give my admiration to one of them and withhold it from the other, merely because they have certain speculative differences with each other—differences which (I see with my own eyes) in no way affect their practice—about the true meaning of the Bible, or the true contents of the Christian Revelation? No :—

For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight ;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.

Catholic.—Well, before saying more about Catholic and Unitarian, let me ask you about your county member. I believe he is also extremely just and beneficent in his dealings and very liberal to charities. You will, I presume, award the same praise to him as to your two friends of whom you have spoken?

L. Your question only shows how little you know of our county gossip. In our part of the world everybody is aware that he does this, not from any motives of justice or benevolence, but simply to serve his own selfish purposes. He has set his heart on continuing to represent our county, and his whole public conduct is directed to that end. If popularity were to be gained by practising injustice and cruelty instead of by the opposite course, injustice and cruelty would be his habitual mode of action.

C. I have obtained from you, then, a very important admission. The external practice of justice and beneficence does not suffice to make a man admirable ; we must consider also most carefully *the motive* for which he practises them.

L. You must have thought me an idiot if you fancied I could doubt it. But I cannot imagine what connection it has with the question before us. You surely cannot mean that my Unitarian friend is no more attached to justice and beneficence for their own sakes than is that humbug, our county member.

C. I do not mean anything of the kind ; and you will very soon see what I do mean. But, before comparing your Unitarian with your Catholic friend, I will compare him with one who is, as I should call it, not above him but below him in the scale of belief. Have you seen much of your neighbour Mr. Harding?

L. I know very little of him myself, but have heard a good deal about him on most trustworthy authority. And it is curious you should name him, because he is the only other man in our county whom I should put on a level with my two friends, the Catholic and the Unitarian, in regard both to private and public excellence. He is a very different sort of a

person, for he leads a literary and bookish sort of life; but a man more benevolent, humane, and just,—a better father, a better friend,—can hardly be found.

C. So I have heard people say. Now, I happen to know that he makes no secret among his personal friends of disbelieving altogether the Existence of God.

L. (After a pause.) Well, I am true to my principles. I can't understand a man being really and on conviction an Atheist. But if Mr. Harding is so, I have no right to blame him because his speculative conclusions differ from my own. And the very fact of his performing his social duties so faithfully is a clear proof of the sincerity with which he has sought truth.

C. You are quite right, of course, in adhering to your principles until you see ground to change them. I only hope you will also adhere to the other principle which you so frankly conceded; viz., that we cannot reasonably admire a man for the mere practice of justice and beneficence, until we have examined the *motives* for which he practises them.

L. I should be a fool, indeed, if I went back from so obvious a truth.

C. And you will admit also the undeniable inference, that the same acts of justice and beneficence will be far more admirable in one man than in another, if the former practises them on far higher and more admirable motives than the latter.

L. This is certainly undeniable; though I begin now to have some glimmering as to your drift.

C. My drift will soon be manifest enough. Let us hope that your Unitarian friend really acts up to his light with reasonable faithfulness. Let us hope that, as he knows himself to have been created by an Infinitely Holy Being, he makes it the one chief end of his life to approve himself to that Being, and live in His fear and love. If this be so, his various acts of justice and beneficence will be actuated, in some degree at least, by the highest of all possible motives, the desire of conforming himself to the Will of his Holy Creator. Again, he will frequently pray, both that he may see more clearly God's Will and Preference in regard to the performance of his social duties, and also that he may conform to that Will and Preference still more faithfully and perseveringly. And further, as he strives more and more to love creatures for the sake of their Creator, so still more earnestly, and as the foundation of all else, he will strive to love the Creator for His own sake. He will contemplate His various attributes; he will study His dealings with man as recorded

in the Bible; he will dwell in thought on His various tender mercies towards himself; and, in fact, will more and more discipline himself in what we Catholics call the interior life. Here, too, I must make one concluding remark, though it does not bear on our immediate question. If he pursues such a course with a faithful and honest heart, knowing intimately as he does your Catholic friend, and having such means of acquaintance with Catholic doctrine, I fully expect that he will become a Catholic himself before he dies.

L. I can see no room for denying that those who believe in God's Existence are bound in some degree to such interior exercises as you mention. I think, indeed, that any candid Atheist would admit as much, on plain grounds of reason and common sense. Nor would it surprise me, though God only knows the heart, to find that my Unitarian friend does practise them.

C. God only, as you say, knows the heart; yet even you and I, who are mere creatures, know very well that Mr. Harding leads a life *toto calo* different from what I have described. It is quite certain that no part whatever of *his* conduct is motivated by the desire of pleasing God, because he thinks that there is no God to please.

L. So much, at all events, is undeniable.

C. Now, we Catholics hold that no one can be an Atheist except for his own grievous sin; but I will not insist on this, as you are (no doubt) of a different opinion. And I will also, for argument's sake, make another concession, which no Catholic would really make; viz., that such a man as Mr. Harding can faithfully fulfil the substance of the moral law in its entirety; that he can consistently and perseveringly practise virtue for its own sake.* Yet even after making, for argu-

* All Catholics will admit as much as is stated in the text; and, indeed, the doctrine that no one can be ignorant of God's Existence without his own grievous sin is equivalent to the proposition that no Atheist is free from such sin. At the same time, there is considerable difference of opinion among Catholics as to the degree of sin in which men ignorant of the One God are certainly plunged, or the degree of virtue to which (while remaining thus ignorant) they can rise. Our own judgment is with those who take the least favourable view. We admit, of course, most fully that any act wherein virtue is pursued for its own sake, is virtuous, though the agent be an Atheist; to think otherwise, would be to fall into Baius's condemned error; an error no less revolting to reason than contrary to faith. But we think (1) that the mere love of abstract virtue will never have much practical influence, in comparison with the more urgent and pressing worldly motives by which men are ever solicited; and we think (2) that a life from which prayer is inevitably absent will quite certainly be stained by fearful corruption of heart. We consider, therefore, that those acts of heathens which are objectively laudable, are motivated far more by pride, vain-glory, ambition, and the like,

ment's sake, so extreme a concession, how deplorable is his state! He is totally incapacitated by his unbelief for what you yourself admit to be immeasurably the highest and most admirable exercises of the human mind. Suppose God, by a

than by love of virtue; and that they are, therefore, not really good, except in a very small degree. In the case of fortitude, indeed, the Church has expressly decreed that this quality is no virtue as found in heathens. For the Council of Orange defines that the fortitude of heathens is caused by worldly cupidity, the fortitude of Christians by love of God. (*Fortitudinem gentilium mundana cupiditas, fortitudinem Christianorum Dei caritas facit.*) No quality, of course, produced by "*mundana cupiditas*" can possibly be a virtue; and for ourselves we believe that the same principle is no less applicable to other objective virtues as practised by heathens, than it is to fortitude. Some Catholics, indeed, have been tempted to think that such language implies a certain tendency to Baianism and Jansenism. We will therefore corroborate our view by two writers, in regard to whom the least suspicion of such a tendency would be simply preposterous.

The first is S. Francis de Sales. "The pagans sometimes displayed some virtues; but their only end was worldly glory: *they had only the appearance of virtue, not its motive and intention*, which is its soul, and *without which there can be no real virtue*. 'Human love,' says the Council of Orange, 'constituted the whole strength of the pagans; charity, that of Christians.' . . . S. Augustine . . . observes, in another place, that the pagan philosophers displayed much virtue, though destitute of real piety; but he corrects himself in his book of Retractions, in which he acknowledges that the virtues of pagans were too imperfect to merit such praise. These virtues resemble glow-worms, which only shine at night, and whose brilliancy is eclipsed by the light of day: they may be called virtues when compared with vices; but are unworthy the name when put in competition with solid Christian virtues. Yet, as they are *not quite vitiated*, they may be compared to decayed fruit: they have the appearance and partly the substance of real virtues, which is moral rectitude; but they are corrupted by the worm of vanity which interiorly gnaws them: to be practised profitably, the good part must be separated from the bad."—(*On the Love of God*, book xi. c. 10.) We should add that we give the passage *verbatim* as it stands in an English translation, dated 1835, and that the whole chapter is occupied with the same subject.

Our second citation shall be from Father Ripalda, S. J., the standard writer (we may say) against Baius, and who had Baius's works before him (as he tells us) when he wrote. "In them" [infidels], he says, "works morally good are rare . . . For love of virtue is most difficult in those whom very many things call back from the honestum, and stimulate to the turpe; but few things incite to the cultivation of virtue. For in them is urgent concupiscence, . . . vast desire of excelling others (*ingens excellentiæ cupido*), frequent love of temporal goods, reason darkened by clouds, the thought and affection for probity small (*probitatis cogitatio et affectio remissa*). There are absent all examples and written exhibitions of virtue (*absunt exempla et documenta virtutis*), sacred utterances, sacraments, and those multiplied helps which cherish the faithful with continual aids of grace, and entice them to the obedience of virtue. . . . Wherefore, temporal and earthly love *always* prevails in these men over the love of virtue . . . Therefore, Augustine never denied virtues as *possible* to infidels; but only as *existing* in them; in the Romans, because the end for which they performed honourable and admirable deeds (*honestæ et egregiæ facinoræ*) was the boasting of praise and of superiority (*laudis et excellentiæ gloria*); in the Epicureans, pleasure; in the

sudden miracle, were to raise him into the position of a pious Theist, the change would be as though the brightest of lights were suddenly introduced into the darkest of caverns. The contrast between his old and new condition would be as great and signal as between a brute and a rational being.

L. On reflection, I cannot see that you put the case too strongly.

C. You must admit, then, that, as regards this doctrine at least, the Existence of God, the knowledge of it is an invaluable blessing, and the ignorance of it is among the heaviest of calamities. You must admit, that he who should devote the whole labour of his life to preaching this doctrine where it has hitherto been unknown, or maintaining it where it is in danger of being lost, would render one of the greatest services which man can possibly render to his fellow-man.

L. I suppose I must admit that the doctrine of God's Existence stands on totally different ground from any other doctrine. But, as you may remember, the particular case on which I insisted was the comparison of a Unitarian, not with an Atheist, but with a Catholic. And you have yourself been betrayed into admitting that a pious Unitarian will be actuated, to some extent at least, in his various acts of justice and beneficence by the highest of all possible motives. I hold you to that admission; and I ask, what can you say more for the Catholic himself?

C. My "admission," as you call it, was not made by accident, but with perfect deliberation; and, in reply to your question, I say in one word, that the Catholic has immeasurably greater inducements and greater facilities for acting on the highest motives than any one can have (except by a kind of miracle) who is external to the Visible Church. I should, first of all, argue at length, if it were to our present purpose, that the very notion of an interior life is (to say the least) altogether kept in the background among non-Catholics; whereas the Church, in her whole practical teaching, is ever impressing on her children its inestimable importance. I should also argue, that her sacraments impart a singular degree of grace towards facilitating its practice, far exceeding any which (in God's ordinary dealings) is given to those without. But both these replies, though most true and most important, are foreign to our

Stoics, self-complacency and self-boasting, and other temporal goods of that kind, which are alien to the excellence of true virtue (*à veræ virtutis honestate aliena*).—*Contra Baium*, d. 20, n. 122.

The subject is of far greater practical moment than might at first appear; but we cannot here pursue it further.

present controversy. Our present controversy, I say, does not turn on the Church's practical teaching, or on her sacramental grace, but on her assertion of the dogmatic principle. We must fix our attention, then, on the great doctrine which is principally at issue between Catholics and Unitarians; and I say that Catholics, precisely in consequence of believing that doctrine, obtain a special facility towards loving God, and making that love the foundation of their whole moral conduct, of which Unitarians are profoundly ignorant, and from which they are totally excluded. I will not deny that a Unitarian may be in invincible ignorance of Catholic doctrine; that he may be really in God's favour and in a state of grace.* But I say, that (putting aside any quasi-miraculous interference) such love of God as he can attain is (if I may so express myself) an empty shadow, when compared to the fulness of love attainable with equal effort by those who hold that great doctrine which he denies.

L. Such a statement fills me with amazement. You admit

* It is of course held by every Catholic, that all who have full means of knowing the Church's divine authority, are under the strict obligation of believing, explicitly or implicitly, everything which she teaches. But there may be some—and no one except God can tell how many—who have not full means of knowing the Church's divine authority. It may, therefore, possibly, be a matter of extreme practical importance, to determine what doctrines must be explicitly believed "*necessitate medii*" (as theologians express it), in order to justification and salvation; for it is implied in the very term, that those who do *not* explicitly believe such doctrines are incapable, under all circumstances (while such unbelief lasts), of justification. Further, all are agreed that belief in One God and in a future state of reward is necessary, "*necessitate medii*;" according to that Scripture, "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder to them that seek Him." But, further than this, a large body of theologians seem to hold that explicit belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation is thus necessary. Other theologians, however, considerable both in numbers and weight, take a different view, and regard no other doctrines as necessary "*necessitate medii*," except the two first-mentioned. Our own convictions are earnestly in accordance with these theologians. There is nothing, we consider, contrary to sound doctrine in the *idea* that a Unitarian who is invincibly ignorant of Catholicism, may be a devout Theist and may be in a state of justification. Whether many, or any, have ever in *fact* risen to such a state, cannot even be guessed except by the Searcher of hearts.

There is another theological question, which is also of the greatest practical moment in regard to such cases; for some theologians hold that no one can elicit an act of faith, unless he recognize the Church as infallibly propounding doctrine. We adhere, however, strongly to the opposite school, of whom Lugo may be taken as the representative; and we maintain that an act of faith is by no means impossible (with the help of *grace*) in one external to the Visible Church and who does not recognize her infallibility. We may also point out that on the other theory, every individual adult who dies externally to the Visible Church will certainly be lost, however inculpable his ignorance may be; for no adult can be justified and saved without an act of faith.

that the Unitarian, no less than his opponent, believes in the One True God; while no one can reverence more sincerely than he does that great Teacher who has been the organ of God's Revelation. The difference between the two has no reference to any doctrine relating to God Himself, but purely to the metaphysical theory which the two have respectively formed concerning the precise nature of that Teacher.

C. I could never understand the meaning of that word "metaphysical" as used by your school. But putting aside verbal controversy, I differ from you most deeply on your whole statement. We Catholics hold firmly, in the strict and literal sense of the words, that Almighty God has undergone excruciating torments for love of His creatures; while Unitarians repudiate the whole notion of His having done so, as false and even absurd. If this be not a difference of doctrine relating to God Himself, it is difficult to imagine what you would call such a difference.

L. You have yourself admitted that it is not so great a difference as to render love of God impossible to the Unitarian.

C. Certainly not impossible; but how immeasurably more difficult. In saying our rosary, *e.g.*, we become every day more intimately familiar with our Lord's chief acts upon earth—acts so unspeakably touching and endearing—and we contemplate them as the very acts of Almighty God. Or we pursue our course from one Station of the Cross to another, and at every step we call to mind that we are contemplating those stages of unspeakable suffering along which the Creator of the world proceeded to His death of ignominy and torment. Is it not plain that by such methods we obtain a familiar acquaintance (if I may so speak) with Almighty God, and a fulness of love for Him, to which the Unitarian must ever be a stranger? According to our doctrine, God so tenderly loved His creatures that rather than not suffer for them, He took to Himself a passible nature for the very purpose of suffering. It is not in human nature to dwell on such a thought without being animated in return by an incomparably deeper and more personal love for Him, than those can experience who regard this our most vital and cherished doctrine as a dream and a superstition.

L. I admit myself unable to reply; though I am not a little surprised by the conclusions at which I seem to find myself landed.

C. In regard, then, to this doctrine, at all events, you will now admit that differences of what you call speculative opinion are unspeakably momentous. We Catholics, as you know, maintain that so soon as any one recognizes the fact of God

having made a Revelation to mankind, he is under the obligation of taking all reasonable pains to discover the contents of that Revelation ; and that he is morally culpable, therefore, if he do not take such pains. This, however, is not the question which you and I have been discussing ; and I mention it only to avoid misconception. But, putting aside this question altogether, there is one revealed doctrine at least—viz., the doctrine that our Saviour is Almighty God—in regard to which you make the following admission. You admit that ignorance of it, even though it were most absolutely inculpable, is among the most serious calamities with which any one can be afflicted ; and (to repeat my former words) that he who should devote the labour of his life to preaching this doctrine where it has hitherto been unknown, or maintaining it where it is in danger of being lost, would render one of the most important services which man can render to his fellow-man.

L. I cannot but admit this.

C. And in admitting it you admit the dogmatic principle. You may still think that the Catholic Church multiplies doctrines unduly, and lays undue stress on some which are of minor importance ; but this is a question of degree, not of principle. I shall be happy, on some future occasion, to discuss with you this question of degree ; but to do so now would only be to take us away from the particular line of controversy in which we have been hitherto engaged.

L. There is still one particular, however, connected with our present controversy, on which I have an objection to make ; though I admit I have now far less confidence in the soundness of my own judgment than I had when our conversation began.

C. I shall be much interested to hear it.

L. Why cannot you Catholics be contented with saying once for all that our Lord is the Son of God, and there leaving the matter ? Why do you amplify this simple statement into ten thousand abstruse propositions, which produce no other effect than confusion and mystification ? My Catholic friend has a domestic chaplain, who is a great student of Theology, and (I believe) writes on it. I admit that he never obtrudes it on me at all ; but, on the contrary, when he wishes to convert me, uses the plainest and most intelligible mode of argument. Still, I have more than once looked into his great folios, and have been amazed at the stress laid on a number of mysterious statements which (I should think) would shock any man of common reason and common sense. They seem to me, in fact, simply an elaborate accumulation of words without any possible corresponding ideas.

C. The very phrase which you have used in speaking of our Lord—"the Son of God"—will supply me with a foundation for my reply. The phrase is, of course, most perfectly orthodox, and it will at once express its true meaning to a Catholic who has been carefully trained in true doctrine. To him the phrase means this—viz., that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Consubstantial Son of the Eternal Father, and (no less truly than the Father Himself) is The One Infinite God, Creator of heaven and earth. But surely you must admit that those who hear the phrase, "Son of God," without having received a doctrinal education, will ordinarily understand it in a sense which is not less than infinitely below the true one. They will understand it, perhaps, to mean that our Lord is the most highly favoured, most highly endowed, best loved of God's creatures, adopted by God as His dearest of sons; but they will not understand it to mean that our Lord is Himself God the Creator.

L. Well, then, make the phrase sufficiently definite for your purpose, and there stop.

C. This is the very thing which the Church has done. She has always made her phraseology sufficiently definite for her present purpose, and has there stopped. I am speaking now of the doctrinal definitions which the Church has herself enacted; for I will refer afterwards to the propositions elaborated by individual theologians. And I will begin with one obvious remark. The doctrine that the Infinite Creator has visited this earth in a created and passible nature, however attractive to the devotional feelings, and hailed with a thrill of delight by those who have humbly laboured to love and serve God, is nevertheless startling in the highest degree both to the reason and to the imagination.

L. This I fully concede.

C. There is consequently a constant tendency in us all to let go our belief in it; and it is only by an effort that we can retain it in our grasp. For myself, indeed, I maintain most confidently that the immense majority of English Protestants (for with foreign Protestants I have no acquaintance)—even those who are furthest removed from all profession of Unitarianism, and who most fully believe themselves to hold the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity,—are, in real truth, quite as far from grasping it as are the Unitarians themselves.* The Church accordingly, to whose custody dogmatic truth has

* This proposition was frequently argued, some twenty years ago, in the "British Critic," and elsewhere. We are thoroughly confident that, then at least, it was altogether well-founded; and we have no reason for supposing (but rather the reverse) that it is not equally true now.

been committed as a sacred trust, is obliged to employ her most powerful and efficacious machinery, if she would secure its retention in the heart and intellect of her children. It can be no matter of surprise, then—at all events it is an undoubted fact—that multitudes of men have at various times, consciously or unconsciously, abandoned this great central Verity, and betaken themselves to one or other of the various errors which abound (as I may say) in its neighbourhood. All these errors, though differing in other respects, yet agree in this : that, on the one hand, they present far less difficulty to reason than the orthodox doctrine presents ; and, on the other hand, that they are totally barren of those precious spiritual fruits which Catholic doctrine so abundantly generates. It is probable enough that great numbers of these heterodox men are unintellectual, and do not trouble themselves to express their misbelief in any scientific shape. But some will be of a different stamp, and will be irresistibly impelled to state and propagate their tenets ; while the multitude will recognize in such statements an expression of their own opinion, and will rally round the standard of these pestilential heresiarchs. Now you have already by implication admitted that these heresiarchs (without at all entering into the question of their moral culpability) are, in matter of fact, endeavouring to inflict on their fellow-men one of the greatest calamities possible. And it must be plain to you that if the Church be what she claims to be, the divinely appointed guardian of doctrine, she would be simply faithless to her mission did she not adopt most energetic measures of resistance.

L. I admit that this conclusion follows from the Catholic theory on the Church's office.

C. And just as her enemies have based their aggressions on an intellectual expression of their heresy, so the Church must base her resistance on an intellectual denial of such heresy. In other words, it is absolutely necessary that she put forth a scientific analysis of the Truth committed to her charge, just so far as is requisite for distinguishing it from the vile counterfeit, which is, at any given period, deluding so many of Christ's redeemed souls. The mere doing this will not be *sufficient* ; no Catholic ever thought so ; and the Church resorts to every legitimate method of opposition. But though an intellectual expression of doctrine be not *sufficient*, yet it is *necessary* ; and without it every other method would fail of due effect. And thus, as time advances and heresy after heresy arises, the Church's dogmatic definitions increase in number and variety, and approach to a complete and rounded exposition of doctrine.

To my own mind, I must say, there is no more interesting study in the whole world than the study of those most clear and beautiful formulæ which the Church has thus successively evolved. She has evolved them, as you now understand, by no arbitrary and despotical exercise of power; but simply by contemplating that one deep and consistent treasure of doctrine which was committed to her keeping, in its relation to those shifting and unstable forms of heresy which have successively infested the world.

L. But surely the extent of these definitions put forth by your Church herself is immeasurably small, when compared with that other class which you mentioned; viz., those elaborated by individual theologians.

C. Immeasurably small, no doubt; and my argument hitherto has only applied to the former. In regard, however, to the whole fabric of dogmatic theology which has been raised by individual thinkers, I must maintain no less confidently that its services have been vast and multitudinous.* I might give many instances of this; but I will select one in particular. And I will continue to use as my illustration that great doctrine, the importance of which you have fully admitted,—the doctrine of our Blessed Lord's Divine Personality. You will admit, of course, that if educated men are to be imbued and penetrated with this great truth, it is essential that they be taught it in an intellectual and scientific shape. If in regard to every other matter of study, it is included in the very idea of their education that they shall learn to analyze their thoughts with accuracy and express them with precision, while on doctrinal matters they are not trained with equal care in a similar habit, the latter will gradually lose all hold and power over their mind. So that, if such were the system of instruction adopted, it is precisely those things which ought to exercise the deepest and most pervasive influence, which would in fact exercise the least.

L. This at all events is undeniable. Whatever else may be doubted, your present proposition no reasonable man can doubt.

C. And it is still more obvious that the whole body of priests—those whom the Church employs to imbue the multitude with sound doctrine—cannot succeed in doing this unless they have themselves grasped it with scientific accuracy.

L. Of course they cannot.

C. Now whatever mental acquisition be in question, you will

* On the general subject of dogmatic theology, we would earnestly direct the reader's attention to some remarks in our short notice of Professor Von Schwane's work.

invariably find this law to hold. If it be necessary that a large body of youths be trained to a certain considerable mastery of it, it is necessary for that very purpose that a small and select body of men shall give their whole lives to its deep and thorough study. These men it is who must be the sources of instruction and arbiters of truth. This is so plain that no one ever thought of questioning it except in the case of Theology. At Oxford, *e.g.*, it is considered very important that all who give their mind to the studies of the place shall acquire a certain considerable refinement of classical taste. For this reason, you have always there a small body of men who devote their whole life to a study of all the niceties of language. Ask any Oxford man whether it is not waste of time thus to ponder on these minutiae, he will reply with no small contempt that the general standard of classical taste cannot possibly be maintained among the many, unless these minutiae be carefully investigated by the few. And if, when he speaks about Theology, he is betrayed into the same fallacy which he has exposed in you, the only reason I can suggest for so strange an inconsistency, is that he cares very much for classical taste and very little for religious doctrine. Certainly it may well excite our amazement, when men whose main pursuit in life is to distinguish between the different shades of meaning conveyed by Greek particles, attack Catholic Theology as accumulating words which are destitute of corresponding ideas. I am not despising this minute and accurate study. If I did so, I should be guilty of the same narrowness which I am censuring in them. But "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." For myself, one so indolent as I am and so averse to sustained application has no right to speak with such confidence as would be reasonable in a hard and laborious student; yet you will perhaps permit me to say so much as this. For many years past, so far as I have studied anything at all, it has been Theology and Theology alone; and my testimony is, that I despair of conveying by words my strong conviction of the deep and absorbing interest presented by that study at every step. As we have been speaking so much of the Incarnation, let me take as my instance that exquisite portion of the "Incarnation" treatise, in which theologians discuss the various gifts and endowments appertaining to that human soul which God the Son assumed as His. If any one can peruse these disquisitions, and gravely say that they do but accumulate words destitute of corresponding ideas, I should expect him to pass the same judgment on Newton's "Principia" or Virgil's "Æneid."

L. I wish some little time for reflection on all which you have said; but from my present impression I fully expect to find it satisfactory. You have turned my whole thoughts (if I may so speak) inside out. I cannot, then, rest contented with my present position, but shall seek an early opportunity of renewing our conversation.

We have written very briefly on a very large subject; but from the one isolated aspect in which we have viewed it, one important inference follows.

The dogmatic principle corresponds to the spirit of faith, while the liberal principle corresponds to the spirit of worldliness. The spirit of worldliness prompts men to lay their whole stress on the external performance of those social duties on which the welfare of our fellow-men so largely depends, and to care very little as to the *motive* for which those duties are performed. But both faith and reason peremptorily declare that the chief moral value of an act is measured precisely by its motive. If, then, we take public opinion for our practical guide, we may consistently enough put up with the liberal principle; but if faith and reason are to direct our course, it will be the main effort of our life to fix our thoughts more and more earnestly on the invisible world, and base our external morality on this our inward gaze. And as soon as this is well understood, it follows as a matter of course, that no other thing can be more vitally and pervasively important, than the having true objects presented to our spiritual vision. Accordingly, it has ever been men of the most interior and mortified life—hermits, monks, religious—who have been the most keen and earnest upholders of the dogmatic principle.

We have prefixed to this article the title, not only of Mr. Shirley's sermon, but also of a volume put forth some few years since by Professor Stanley. We have done so, because the volume has for its chief object an enforcement of the liberal principle; and because even such incomplete and inadequate remarks as we have made in this article are amply sufficient for enabling us to pass a judgment on the work. We are far, indeed, from implying that the work is simply, or even predominantly, repulsive to a Catholic. Although it affords no opportunity for that picturesque description and variety of historical illustration by which the author's other productions are distinguished, yet it furnishes examples of a quality far more attractive and far more important. For while any Catholic who reads it cannot but observe its utter failure,

when compared with our own ascetical works, as an exhibition of the Christian life, he will not (we think) less readily confess that it abounds with indications of a pious and loving spirit. We will quote one passage of this character, for more than one reason; partly, indeed, as instancing that inaccuracy of thought and expression which again and again takes us by surprise in so accomplished a writer. For the words which we shall cite seem plainly to imply that it is not always an indispensable duty to forgive injuries. We most willingly do Dr. Stanley—not the charity, but—the simple justice of believing, as a matter of course, that he himself never dreamed of such a doctrine. But we will give in italics the particular parts of the passage to which we refer, in order that the reader may judge for himself as to their legitimate drift. Dr. Stanley is speaking of “those who have injured us or whom we have injured; . . . those who misunderstand and misrepresent us; those whom we *cannot help* regarding with dislike, suspicion, resentment. How,” he asks, “are we to deal with these? . . . What return can we make? What weapons of offence or defence can we adopt? It is difficult to forgive, it is impossible to forget. Let the Apostle’s words show us a way *which may be better than either forgiving or forgetting*. ‘Conquer their evil by your good.’ When an occasion of kindness offers itself, seize it; when an opportunity for telling of their good deeds, tell of them gladly; when their hearts soften, do not repel them with harshness; when the quarrel has been soothed by time or distance, do not seek to revive it” (pp. 278-9).

Another reason for our quoting this passage is, that the author has so remarkably exemplified his own advice. As regards, indeed, the *principles* opposed to his own, we often find in Dr. Stanley a degree of intolerance and asperity little consistent with his abstract professions. But in regard to the individual maintainers of those principles, we have never seen the least indication of such a tendency; but very much the reverse. We doubt if a single passage can be found in all his works in which he speaks harshly of individual opponents; and we have been often extremely struck by his unostentatiously going out of his way to say the kindest things of them in the most generous manner. And we are glad to avow that such general manifestation of personal character as is made by Dr. Stanley’s writings, is to us in many respects very attractive: in its simplicity, its earnestness, its wide and true benevolence.

It is among the keenest of griefs to see one so amiable and well-intentioned devote the whole stress of his character and his exertions to the support of a theory which we hold to be

profoundly immoral and anti-Christian ; and from which, we are sure, if he saw it carried on to its legitimate consequences, he would himself recoil. Among the upholders of this theory, in any given age or country, two very different classes of men will be found prominent. The one class are men of shrewd, active, and busy minds, who are wonderfully quick in observing practical inconsistencies and scenting out intellectual difficulties, but who are altogether indifferent to piety, even in the vaguest sense of that word ; while as to what we Catholics call the interior life, they are unsuspicious of its very existence. On the other hand, there are men who are far inferior to these in depth and clear-sightedness, but who have a real sympathy with piety wherever manifested. These men at the same time have no appreciation whatever of that more heroic love of God which we call saintliness, nor, indeed, any insight (such as a Catholic training would give them) into the real workings of the human heart. Partly from this cause, and partly from the intellectual deficiency to which we have referred, they imagine themselves to recognize equal love of God under most opposite forms of doctrine. And this once assumed, by an impulse which is even laudable, they are indignant that this "deep Christian union" should be disturbed by the jar of "speculative controversies." These men are catspaws to the advocates of a deeper and more consistent liberalism ; and their services to the evil cause are extremely great. For their amiableness and love of piety blind the eyes of a thoughtless multitude to the detestable character of that theory which they advocate ; and cause us to be regarded as persecutors of injured innocents, when we speak of it with due severity.

Before commenting more directly on these sermons, we will make one preliminary remark. All Catholics, of course, hold that in the Church alone is to be found the pure and unsullied Gospel. We admit most cheerfully—and it is a great pleasure to think—that larger or smaller fragments of the Truth are found externally to her pale, and that so far as they do exist they may be productive of much spiritual benefit ; but we maintain that everywhere except within the Church the Truth is defiled and debased by the admixture of those multifarious corruptions which accrue from human schools and human traditions. In regard, then, to those defenders of the dogmatic principle who are external to the Church, we are in no way called on to vindicate the reasonableness of *their* attitude. We should, no doubt, sympathize with them much more than with their opponents ; and in this very article we have been well pleased to mention with due honour Mr. Shirley's sermon. But the

very fact of their non-submission to the Church makes it probable that much reasonable exception may be taken against their course of thought and of action. The Catholic Church, however, has been at all times the most prominent upholder of the dogmatic principle ; and, as such, is, doubtless, the chief, though not the exclusive, object of our author's attack. To the defence of her against that attack we confine our argument.

From the beginning to the end of the volume before us, the reader's attention is constantly arrested by vague and indefinite hints as to some terrible evils which have accrued to Christendom from a long-continued over-estimate of the importance of sound doctrine. But putting aside all question of the *arguments* by which Dr. Stanley supports his proposition, we have been totally unable to discover, with any kind of clearness, what that proposition *is*. We will recite in order various theories, which this or that individual passage seems to suggest, but which in every case some other passage, or the general context of the work, unmistakably disavows.

1. From a very large number of his expressions, and indeed from the general drift of sermon after sermon, Dr. Stanley would be understood to mean that the revealed message consists exclusively in the promulgation of Christian morality ; and that all matters of doctrine appertain to the sphere, not of revelation, but of open and speculative opinion. Yet, look at the seventh sermon, and we are told a most different tale. "The subject round which all" our Lord's "teaching turns, is *Himself*" (p. 91). "If Christ was no more than a Socrates, a Socrates He was not. He points to Himself as the ultimate object of His teaching ; and the fact that He, being what He was, did so point to Himself, is a proof that He is the object of our belief and our *worship*" (p. 93). "Christ, the *All-holy, All-pure, All-wise Lord*" (p. 99). This language can have no other imaginable meaning, than that our Lord declared Himself to be the Eternal God, and that this declaration was "the subject round which all His teaching turns." The author seems (for whatever reason) very unwilling to say this expressly ; but if he meant anything less than this, he would be simply trying to stultify his readers, by using phrases which sound largely and mean nothing at all. We do not for a moment suspect him of this ; and we must suppose him, therefore, to hold that the very principal part of the Christian Revelation is what liberals call a "speculative doctrine"—namely, that the Eternal Creator visited this earth in human nature.

2. Perhaps, then, our author would say that speculative

doctrine is, at all events, a *less prominent* part of Christian Revelation than is the promulgation of Christian morality. But we have just seen him stating precisely the reverse; and it would be strange indeed to affirm that the awful and startling doctrine of God having become man is a minor and subordinate part of any Revelation which should contain it.

3. Sometimes, from Dr. Stanley's language, especially in his Preface, we half imagine him to think that Catholics do not account Moral Truth as part of the Divine depositum. It may be worth our while, therefore, at all events to mention, what every Catholic knows to be a first principle of his religion. The Revelation made by God and committed to the Church's infallible keeping is composed of two great branches; viz., doctrine and morals. "The respect due to our neighbour, the duty of fair dealing even towards opponents, the necessity of a spirit of equity and charity" (Preface, p. vi.), are no less distinctly taught by the Church than are the Trinity and the Incarnation; and he who should deny the former would be accounted by all Catholics as no less heterodox than he who should deny the latter.

4. Yet even supposing (what indeed is not improbable) that Dr. Stanley is ignorant of the Church's creed in this particular, such ignorance would be very far from explaining all the statements which he has made. We would refer, for instance, to a passage in which he ascribes universal uncharitableness to all past generations. He interprets certain words of S. Paul as sanctioning the liberal principle; and he adds this reflection:—

They were written, it may almost be said, before they could be understood by any one: they were written *to lie forgotten and buried for ages*. Here and there some genial spirit, like the friend of Augustine, like *the good* S. Bernard, like Sir T. More, like Richard Baxter, like Bishop Ken, may have caught a *glimpse* into their deep truth; but for the most part we have but to look at the course of Christian history, and we tremble at the contrast which they present (pp. 176-7).

Dr. Stanley repeatedly mourns over the severe censures put forth by his opponents on the doctrines of their fellow-Christians. But certainly no advocate of the dogmatic principle ever approached, even distantly, to this liberal theorist, in the sweeping and severe character of his denunciations. Our author has not a moment's scruple or hesitation in giving utterance to the keenest invective against what he admits to have been the fundamental principle held by almost every individual bearing the Christian name, from the days of the Apostles to the "nineteenth or eighteenth century" (p. 176).

It is not, however, chiefly for the sake of this remark that we have quoted the passage, but as a means of assisting us in the perplexing task of discovering what is the exact charge brought by Dr. Stanley against the dogmatic principle. For, if we go on a few lines further, the gravamen of that charge would seem to be that Christians have contended with each other, not on points of doctrine at all, but on mere ceremonial: "vestments and postures, new moons and fast-days and feast-days and Sabbaths." If this be really his charge, it shows the most extraordinary thoughtlessness. It is perfectly notorious that in those centuries when, more than at any other period, theological controversies shook the whole fabric of Christian society to its foundation, the central doctrine round which the contest raged was that which Dr. Stanley admits to be the principal matter of our Lord's teaching, viz. the Incarnation.

5. Our author, then, at any rate, must give up his talk about "vestments, postures, and new moons," and he may perhaps therefore shift his ground. He may state as his grievance, that the great mass of those whom Catholics regard as heretical really held the great doctrine in question, but refused adhesion to the "subtle and unmeaning formulæ" put forth by the Church to express it. We cannot, indeed, find any part of the present volume in which this objection is made; but as it is not improbably in his mind, we will suggest to him the true state of the case. God the Son visited this earth, not simply in the external appearance of a man, but in the fulness and perfection of human nature. This may be called the great central Truth revealed in the Gospel; and its constant contemplation is the mainstay and support of all holy souls. We maintain confidently, that there is not one heresy on the subject condemned by the Church—Apollinarian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Monothelite—which does not, in one shape or other, seek to overthrow that doctrine from its very foundation. If Dr. Stanley really wishes to join an explicit issue on that liberal principle which he so fondly cherishes, let him speak directly, and not in the way of insinuation; let him deal with particulars, and not with generals. Let him state which of the above heresies Catholics could have abstained from opposing without abandoning altogether the very essence of Gospel Truth.

6. But the passage which we so lately cited points to another possible explanation of Dr. Stanley's drift. He may mean, perhaps, that, however necessary these controversies were, they have been sullied by every angry, bitter, uncharitable feeling. Of course, since Catholics are peccable, and

since large numbers of them have taken a prominent part in controversy, it will be certain, *à priori*, that in several cases much sin and imperfection would be mixed with laudable zeal. But the amount of this bitterness has been preposterously exaggerated by Protestant thinkers, for a very natural reason. They are totally ignorant of some among the deepest phenomena of the human mind, and are unable to understand, ever so distantly, the real reasons which induce saintly men to struggle for pure doctrine as for their most precious treasure. In every case, therefore, where this keen and eager interest is displayed, Protestants have no solution of the problem, except in the imputation of bitterness and uncharitableness. However, if all that Dr. Stanley means is merely that contentions in behalf of pure doctrine should be carried on with Christian charity and self-command, he is uttering an obvious truth, which every one admits in theory, and which it is, no doubt, very important practically to urge and enforce. But the whole context forbids us to suppose that he means no more than this.

7. The same passage suggests another solution of the riddle ; for he speaks of "Christians persecuting Christians to prison, to torture, to death." But this is introducing quite new matter. An upholder of the dogmatic theory will undoubtedly maintain that the teachers of heterodoxy are enemies to mankind, and that they seek to inflict one of the gravest possible calamities on their fellow-men. But it does not follow that he would consign them, if he could, to "prisons, torture, and death." This is a separate question altogether, which must be argued on its own independent grounds. Dr. Stanley entertains a most laudable zeal for Christian morality. Let us suppose, then, that a body of men were banded together for the purpose of extirpating this morality from the face of the earth. Dr. Stanley would regard these men as enemies to mankind, and as seeking to inflict one of the gravest possible calamities on their fellow-men. But it does not at all follow that he would be glad to imprison, to torture, and to kill them.

We must profess ourselves, then, unable to discover, unable even to guess, what is our author's precise ground of objection to the dogmatic principle. But as we have complained so much of his indefiniteness, it is only fair to say that he does make three definite statements, which in some degree bear on the question. He mentions three different matters of doctrine on which he considers that controversy has been unnecessarily and injuriously lavished :—1. Predestination (p. 65) ; 2. Assurance (p. 65) ; 3. Sacramental grace (p. 95). We have no space, of course, for entering on so wide a dis-

cussion; but one of these three tenets, that of Assurance, is so singularly treated by our author, that some comment is called for.

By the doctrine, then, of "assurance" is meant the Calvinistic doctrine that faith (which secures Heaven) consists in the infallible "assurance" of our possessing indefectible acceptance before God. Now, our author speaks in one sermon with deserved severity and disgust of Rush's case, "a well-known murderer, who having lived in the indulgence of foul passions, and at last attempted to murder a whole household, yet never lost his belief that he was one of the chosen of Christ; and in the last days of his life wrote with unshaken assurance of hope, and marked underneath, for the benefit of his children, *passages in a religious book which spoke of Christ as the Saviour, and of faith as the one thing needed for salvation*," (p. 99). What was the odious feature in Rush? Plainly and undeniably his holding that tenet of "assurance," which Dr. Stanley would have us to regard as an "abstract and disputed doctrine" (p. 65). That the doctrine is "disputed," we are happy for the credit of human nature most fully to admit; but that it is purely "abstract," Rush's poor victims would probably have been disposed to deny. Now, the Church has proscribed and anathematized this disgusting and blasphemous heresy from the moment when it was first invented. And is it not monstrous that the only thanks she receives for her pains from this champion of Christian morality, is to be told that, in condemning this heresy, she has neglected "the weightier matters of the law—justice, mercy, and truth"? (p. 65).

We must not conclude without referring to one of Dr. Stanley's most singular opinions. In his fifth sermon, after referring to the Sermon on the Mount as an illustration of his meaning, he proceeds to say that "Christian doctrine contains a vast body of truth, *on which there is no difference at all amongst any who call themselves by the name of Christ*" (p. 63). And in his next sentence he explains himself to speak of "the moral and spiritual doctrines which form the substance of the greater part of our Lord's teaching and the main object of all of it." Such then is his statement; viz., that as to that vast body of truth which is specially contained in the Sermon on the Mount, there is no difference at all among any who call themselves by the name of Christ. This is plainly and undeniably his statement; and let us see what it involves.

It would appear, then, to be Dr. Stanley's opinion that when the mass of Protestants contemplate any given individual

—statesman, or warrior, or man of science—the standard according to which they deal forth praise or blame, is the standard held forth in the Sermon on the Mount: that they praise and admire him precisely in proportion as they believe him to be more “poor in spirit,” more “clean in heart,” more “meek,” more given to “hunger and thirst after righteousness:” * that they regard a soldier as admirable only so far as he possesses an interior readiness to turn one cheek when smitten on the other; and a statesman only so far as he is devoted to laying up for himself treasure in Heaven. One would have thought Dr. Stanley had lived the life of a hermit—secluded altogether, not only from the world’s presence, but from all knowledge of its daily words and acts.

Our own belief on this head differs widely enough from his. Taking for illustration this country of England, in which Dr. Stanley writes and we criticise, what is the measure by which Protestants morally appreciate their fellow-men? Speaking broadly, and with certain most honourable exceptions, it is as follows:—On the one hand is the worldly standard of morality, such as is exemplified in the periodical press and in the ordinary language of society. This is, in principle, not different from the old heathen morality: it fully recognizes, indeed, the virtuousness of such qualities as justice, generosity, gratitude; but it lays no stress (to say the very least) on poverty of spirit, or cleanness of heart, or hunger and thirst after righteousness, while it dins into our ears its ceaseless praises of “high spirit,” “sense of honour,” “patriotism,” personal bravery, intellectual power. And in broad contrast with this, but equally un-Christian, stands out the judgment of the so-called “religious world;” which measures a man’s acceptableness to God, not at all by his growth in heavenly virtues, but by the inexpugnable strength of his conviction that he will himself be infallibly saved; and which (if it had the gracelessness to be consistent) would rank the murderer Rush as higher in God’s favour than S. Bernard or S. Augustine.

On the other hand, would you see a body of Christians among whom the Sermon on the Mount is visibly embodied as their rule of life, visit and examine any one you may choose to select of our various monasteries and convents. Would you acquaint yourself with those holy souls who have obeyed that Divine Discourse in an heroic degree, study the Church’s

* We have ventured on this occasion thus to translate “justitiam,” that we may be understood aright by the Protestants with whom we are in controversy.

hagiology. Our Lord's words cannot be even recited by our lips without calling to our mind the characteristics of that truly blessed company. Blessed indeed are those who are poor in spirit, meek, and mourners; who hunger and thirst after righteousness; who are merciful, clean of heart, and peacemakers; who are reviled and persecuted, and have all evil spoken against them falsely, for Christ's sake. Who are these, in their very idea and mode of life, but holy religious? Who are these, in heroic consistency and perfection, but the Church's saints? And if we would know how far Protestants in general really believe in the morality taught by Jesus Christ, we may come to an accurate conclusion by observing the opinions which they entertain on Catholic religious and Catholic saints.

We agree most cordially with Dr. Stanley—we say this in no spirit of irony, but in the sincerity of our heart—we agree most cordially with what is evidently Dr. Stanley's sincere conviction, viz., that there can be no higher, holier, more blessed work than the enforcing on men's hearts and consciences, primarily on our own, the morality preached by our Blessed Lord. There is no work to which the Catholic Church throughout the world, under the Roman Pontiff her visible head, devotes herself more unremittingly. We only wish that our author would study her ascetical works and lives of saints, that he may discern in our Lord's words a far greater depth and width than any of which he now dreams. But the result of such endeavours will be what he little suspects. For we believe there is no phenomenon more certain than that in proportion as men labour, by God's grace, to rise towards the various holy tempers of mind enunciated by our Lord, in that proportion one or other of two results will certainly ensue. If they are non-Catholic, they will be more and more dissatisfied with their position; they will more and more earnestly seek for greater stability and definiteness of doctrine than they now possess: in one word, they will be embarked in that course of inquiry which has no legitimate issue except union with the Church. On the other hand, if they are already Catholic, they will cling even more closely and eagerly to that great body of doctrine, in all its fulness, which, as the Church teaches us, He has committed to her keeping.

ART. VII.—THE CATHOLIC CONGRESS OF MALINES.

Assemblée Générale des Catholiques en Belgique. Première Session à Malines, 18—22 Aout, 1863. Programme des Travaux—Questions—Projets de Solution—Propositions. Bruxelles: Imprimerie de Th. Lesigne.

THE moral worth of the Catholic Congress of Malines was very well expressed by Count Schoerrer, President of the Pius-Verein in Switzerland, in a few words: "Switzerland is the least among the nations, but it waters all lands—Germany by the Rhine, France by the Rhone, Italy by the Ticino." So the Congress was a point of union, and a source of Catholic spirit and of Catholic devotion, to all people. To compare a lesser with a greater event, it has an importance of the same kind as the Canonization of last year, which, as we believe, gave a turn and impulse to the Catholic, and even the political opinion of Europe. The nations and governments which had been menacing or patronizing the Holy See, found an internal movement within their own frontiers, and saw an assembly gathered from the whole Christian world, which represented an Empire in which all are contained, as the less in the greater. There can be no doubt that this manifestation of the unity and the universality of the Church, of its unanimity and resolute purpose to maintain the laws of its existence and of its authority, made a deeper impression on the minds of the governments and the people of Europe, than they were willing to confess. Witness the tone of the public papers, the weathercocks, which nevertheless tell the direction of the wind. The most hostile were bitter, indeed, but baffled and impotent; and the greater number were silent, or spoke only in narration of events which they could neither deny nor counteract by commenting on them. After the return of the bishops and faithful to their own homes, began a second movement, which diffused through every European nation the mind and spirit which they brought with them from Rome. To this we may ascribe, not, indeed, the existence of the Congress of Malines, because it has had its forerunner in the Pius-Verein of Germany, but the singular enthusiasm which marked its proceedings. It cannot fail, on the publication of its acts, powerfully to arouse the Catholic spirit of the nations who were represented there.

It is not our intention, however, to write a description of the Catholic festival, which made the grave old archiepiscopal city of Malines alive for a whole week with such an unwonted stir of activity. We must refer our readers to those who have the pictorial hand of artists and historians. Nor do we attempt to treat of the subjects discussed in the Congress, as this would require a careful analysis of certain great constitutional principles, of the ecclesiastical and political order, which were largely enunciated by some of the most distinguished Catholics of our times. On them we shall hope, ere long, to speak fully, and as the importance of the subjects may require. All we propose in this short notice is to give an outline of what the Congress was, and what it proposed to itself to do. It was, then, an assembly of Catholics of all nations, invited by a circular letter bearing the name of the Baron de Gerlache, the supreme judge of the Court of Cassation, resembling our Court of Chancery, a man dear to the Belgian people and to all Catholics who remember the liberation of the Church in Belgium from the anti-Catholic intolerance of Holland. This circular was issued by a council of administration appointed to convene and to direct the Congress. But we may regard the whole as emanating from the high authority under whose eye and in whose presence every act of the Congress passed,—the venerable primate of Belgium, the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines. It seemed to us a noble act of paternal authority for the primate of a country to invite his suffragans with their flocks, that is, a whole nation, to meet together around the metropolitan See. And the fervour and determination exhibited by the Belgians in these days of coldness and cowardice, gave us a deep impression of what would be the vast power of the Church when identified with the spirit and mind of a whole Catholic people.

Although in the circular all politics were avowedly excluded, nevertheless the Congress of Malines must have a very marked influence upon the state of the country. To estimate this aright, it is necessary to recall to memory a few facts. All who have watched the political movements of Belgium during the last thirty years, well know that the Catholic and the so-called liberal parties have been nearly evenly balanced, and in continual conflict. The Revolution of 1830 established the Belgian constitution on the basis of what are called its four liberties: that is, 1. of Worship; 2. of Education; 3. of the Press; 4. of Association. The liberal party, by a strange perversion of its professed character and spirit, has of late years been working to turn the constitution against the Catholic Church, and to interfere with its endowments, its con-

ventual bodies, and its education. Recently it has endeavoured to interfere with the education even of girls. The Catholics, it appears, have received these attacks until lately with somewhat of apathy. They are a vast majority in all the electoral bodies; nevertheless, from want of organization and of competent leaders, they have certainly lost ground in the Legislature. But of late a sense of danger has aroused them from their lethargy, and in many of the elections the Government candidates have been rejected. The Prime Minister himself has shared this fate. Now, although throughout the whole Congress no name of any political personage was introduced, yet all who were aware of the conflict now being carried on in Belgium, could see the direct application of the great principles there enunciated; and the enthusiastic acclamations with which they were hailed were a sign of the consciousness which animated the assembly. It is necessary also to bear this in mind, in order to understand the motives and the purpose of much which would otherwise sound to our ears as generalities, or as declarations, the import of which was not sufficiently weighed, and fraught with consequences the very reverse of all the speakers would desire.

But to return to our immediate subject. The bishops of France were not represented by so much as one of their number, for reasons which will be easily imagined. The bishops of Germany were absent—for what cause we do not know. The assembly was composed of the two cardinals of Malines and of Westminster, the patriarch of Jerusalem, the bishops of Gand, Tournay, and Namur, in Belgium; of Beverley in England, and Adelaide in Australia; to these may be added prelates from various countries, a large body of ecclesiastics of every grade, and some thousands of laymen, chiefly Belgian and French. The other nations were not so numerous represented.

The Congress fell in happily with the Octave of the Assumption and with the Jubilee of our Lady of Hanswyck, a sanctuary which claims an antiquity of 875 years, and is frequented with great devotion. On Monday the king of Belgium gratified his Catholic subjects by his presence; and on the Tuesday the Congress was solemnly opened by a Pontifical High Mass, sung by the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines at the cathedral of S. Rombaut. The church was thronged by men only; and the Roman Rite was inaugurated with great solemnity. It had been used, indeed, for the first time on the Saturday before, the Feast of the Assumption. But the pomp of this opening day may well be regarded as its public inauguration. From the church the members of the Congress repaired to the

Lesser Seminary of the diocese, in which the large halls and lecture-rooms had been prepared for the general assembly and the sections.

The mode of proceeding has been so fully given in the newspapers, that we need not here enter into any detailed account. Anybody who has attended a meeting of the British Association will know how the work of the general body and of the sections is arranged. In truth, as the world steals most things from the Church, so has it taken as its pattern for such assemblies what may be called the skeleton form of a General Council.

In order to present an adequate view of its work, it would be necessary to reprint the whole of the programme which was distributed among its members. But as this mere outline forms a pamphlet of many pages, we must content ourselves with an analysis. The Congress divided itself into five sections, and the subjects assigned to each were as follows. Under each several head, the synopsis of subjects gives first what may be called a preamble, reciting facts and principles, and next the *vœu*, or resolution founded on it:—

PROGRAMME OF SUBJECTS.

A.—SECTIONS.

1st Section.—*Religious Works.*

1. The condition, regulation, and extension of the S. Peter's Pence.
2. The Catholic work of the interment of the poor, and the "bona mors." Associations, usages, and practices in different parts of Belgium and other countries.
3. The religious observance of the Sunday.
4. Missions. Work of the united Churches of the East, &c.

2nd Section.—*Works of Charity.*

1. General condition of the free works of charity: obstacles they have to contend with: means of consolidating and developing Catholic charitable institutions.
2. Suggestion of works to meet the most urgent wants of the present day, and the measures to be taken for their foundation and extension.

3rd Section.—*Christian Education and Instruction.*

1. Means of extending and propagating Catholic teaching and schools.
2. Diffusion of good books, the forming of libraries, &c.

4th Section.—*Christian Art.*

1. Art in its bearings on Catholicism; the teaching and diffusion of Christian art.
2. Style, decoration, and restoration of religious works of art.
3. Religious music.

5th Section.—*Religious Liberty, Publications, International Correspondence, &c.*

1. The state of the press as regards Catholic interests, and means of developing it.
2. Catholic associations and clubs.
3. International correspondence.

B.—GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

1. Report and notices of the state and progress of Catholicism in different countries.
2. Report of the work of the propagation of the Faith; its condition, progress, and results.
3. Reports and notices of the works of charity and instruction in Belgium, and in foreign countries.

C.—PUBLIC MEETINGS.

1. Discourses on the great questions bearing on Catholic interests.
2. Communications of the Committee.

The discussions and resolutions of each section were reduced to a report by their respective secretaries, and read to the general assembly for adoption at the next public meeting. It was on these occasions that the public addresses of a general character were added, of which the following is a list. The order of delivery was somewhat changed, but the topics were as here given :—

1st Meeting.—Wednesday, August 19th, at half-past 5.

The Viscount E. de Kerkhove : On the Duties and Hopes of Catholics.

M. Woeste : On the Struggles and Triumphs of the Church.

Signor Casoni : On the State of Catholics in Italy.

M. Adolphe Dechamps : On the Threefold Object of the Congress—Union, Publicity, and Liberty.

2nd Meeting.—Thursday, August 20th, at half-past 5.

Count de Montalembert : On the Church Free in Free States.

Rev. Père Lescœur de l'Oratoire : On the Catholic Church in Poland.

M. C. Périn : On the Social Mission of Charity.

The Count Foucher de Careil : On Solidarity among Nations, and the Persistency of the Spirit of Nationality.

3rd Meeting.—Friday, August 21st.

M. Schollaert : The Church and the Spirit of the Day.

His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman : On the Condition—Religious and Civil—of Catholics in England.

M. Verspeyen : On the S. Peter's Pence.

Count de Montalembert : Liberty of Conscience with reference to the Interests of the Catholic Church.

4th Meeting.—Saturday, at half-past 11 A.M., at the Church of S. Rombaut.

Rev. Père Dechamps : On the Greatness and Power of the Catholic Church.

M. l'Abbé Mermillod, of Geneva : The Union of Christian Churches.

M. l'Abbé Soubiranne : On the Works of the Oriental Churches and Schools.

• His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman : Allocution.

It is impossible for us to follow these subjects with any comment, or to attempt an account of what passed in five days during a period of from four to nine hours a day. All we can do is to enumerate some of the topics which elicited the most marked and vehement enthusiasm, and to add a few general observations upon them. The mere passing mention of the name of the Sovereign Pontiff called forth such a demonstration as we have never before witnessed in a body of three or four thousand men. Next, in the degree of interest excited, came the Temporal Power, as the expression and guarantee of the independence of the Church in all lands; then the liberty of the Church in all lands, especially in Belgium; then Catholic Poland, its fidelity and its sufferings; and, finally, the University of Louvain, the pattern of a Catholic university, in its independence and its Catholic spirit.

There were other and minor subjects on which the Sections exhibited great zeal and a decided judgment; of which we mention two, as they were somewhat unlooked for, at least as respects the unanimity with which they were received: the observance of the Sunday, and the return to the use of plain chant. We do but perform the part of a narrator in recording the latter fact, without intending thereby to adopt any general practical inference.

It is remarkable that the public journals of the Continent have spoken of the Congress with almost uniform respect—some of course in a spirit of opposition, but none, as far as we know, with any attempt to deny the moral weight due to such an assemblage of men. Something of a depreciating tone may indeed be traced in other quarters where it was least expected, but chiefly on points as to which we should have thought a little experience of men out of our *quatuor maria* would have obviated misconception. But upon the whole, all men, friends and foes, seem agreed that the Congress of Malines was an unmistakable, manly, and outspoken demonstration of Catholic principles and spirit. It was a re-echo of the Canonization of last year, and gave back to Rome the accents which came from thence, in the resolute tones of the Northern races. As such it will have its effect—not only on men of good will, but also on men of ill will, who abound in our day.

It has made the Catholics of these countries conscious of the support they derive from their brethren in other lands. As the handful of Europeans in British India rest upon the moral power of the British empire, and upon England, a month's journey far away, so the handful of Catholics in England rest upon the Universal Church. The more intimately they realize their union with foreign nations, the more vigorous and firm they will become. We are apt to be cowed and scared by the lordly oppression of public opinion, and not to bear ourselves as men in the face of the anti-Catholic society of England. It is a good thing to have an habitual consciousness that the public opinion of Catholic Europe looks upon Protestant England with a mixture of impatience and compassion which more than balances the arrogance of the English people towards the Catholic Church in these countries. For this reason we should wish to see these congresses held year by year; and we were glad to observe that committees were formed for most of the nations present; namely, Italy, England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, and Mexico. We hope the Catholics of these countries will maintain such communications, so as to enable them, as we say of combined armies in warfare, to feel each other, and to support each other, even at a distance. We are engaged in a contest in which the Catholic and Christian society of the world is at stake, and we must draw more closely together; for unity is our strength, and unity is invincible. We felt also as we watched the progress of the sections, and listened with surprise to the details of Catholic piety and charity brought together from all parts, that such interchange of thought and experience is the surest mode of multiplying the works which, with so much inventiveness and so much fertility, the Church is putting forth every day.

But that which seemed to us of chief importance was the enunciation of certain great principles of the Catholic Church, which she can never abandon or forget in her whole dealings with modern society. On one point all men seemed to agree; namely, that the primitive and mediæval forms of society are dead, and will return no more; that we have to face new combinations of human life; and to deal with new phenomena and new problems of political action and power. This is not new; but it is well to look it in the face, and to take the full measure of the crisis. In such an inundation of words, it is impossible that there should not have been some in which we could not concur. We were aware of this, particularly, in one whose power of oratory made it difficult to maintain at the moment a steady view of certain truths which seemed to be overlooked.

Our respect for M. de Montalembert makes us desire to accept whatsoever may fall from his lips ; and for great part of his eloquent discourses we render him our cordial thanks. On those points where we differ we do not intend now to enter at length. On a future day the subject will fall naturally under consideration in our pages. For the present all we will do is to note down certain reflections which were forced upon us by his words, and by the ardent appeals of others to the progress of modern society.

The more we study the history of the Church, the more we are convinced that it has passed through two distinct periods, or epochs, and has entered into a third. In the earliest, which extended over the first 300 years, the Church was a family of individuals gathered out of households, cities, and nations, knit together into a society, isolated among the kingdoms of the world, independent, and persecuted. No whole nation as yet belonged to the unity of the Church ; hardly a whole city—in many countries, not even whole families. It had therefore no relation to or contact with the governments, legislatures, or corporate life of any nation. The direction of individuals was all it as yet accomplished. After the conversion of Constantine, a second period set in. Christianity began to pervade whole races, to act upon society, and to have relations with the Civil power. The laws of Christianity began to pass into the civil code ; for instance, the law of Christian marriage, its unity and indissolubility. As this period advanced, the civil society of the world became Christian. The first example of a perfectly Christianized civil power was that of Rome, which gradually assumed the form we now call the Temporal Power of the Popes. From Rome sprang the Christian civilization of Europe. In this period not only individuals were redeemed from the disorder and immorality of the world, but, in its measure, society also. The laws of God became the laws of the political order. The revealed morality became the acknowledged rule of legislation and of executive and judicial power. Society, as such, and in its corporate action, was conformed to Christianity, and actively promoted the observance of Christian morality.

This second period may be said to have lasted until the great Lutheran revolt. From that time began the separation of the Church and the civil society of the world. Paradoxically, the Reformation seemed to consecrate the civil power by making princes supreme in religion. But this was a mere transient phase. The establishment of private judgment let in a flood of error, and rendered Christian society impossible. In three hundred years the penal laws of Protestant princes,

which have been the shame and scandal of the Christian world, violated what was professedly the first principle of the Protestant Reformation. They proclaimed liberty of conscience, and put men to death for using it. At last private judgment has prevailed, and penal laws have been abolished, because their execution has become impossible. But the State, which Luther stripped of its Catholic character, has since by his offspring been stripped of its Christian character. It has become tolerant of all error—that is, indifferent to Truth. It can no longer affirm any truth, and therefore accepts into itself all error. It is desecrated and left to its own natural will. Society out of Catholic unity is without God in the world. It neither submits to the guidance of the Church, nor guides itself by the laws of Christianity. Witness the laws of divorce which have established themselves in half of Europe. Christian society springs from the Sacrament of Matrimony; and the admission of divorce violates the principles of its origin and of its maintenance. A society which admits divorce denies both the Faith and the authority of the Church, and constitutes itself upon a basis outside of Christianity, or, in other words, on the basis of natural morality interpreted by the corrupt traditions of mankind. Such is the society of the Lutheran Reformation, which, while Protestantism is dying as a religion, is spreading as a form of politics. Such we believe is the last analysis of all the theories of political society which base themselves upon the equal recognition of religious truth and religious error.

We hold, then, that it is the duty of every Catholic to oppose by all lawful means the desecration of civil society; and therefore, certainly, not only to refrain from enunciating as principles of predilection the so-called liberty of speech, worship, conscience, and the like, which is, in fact, to proclaim that society is incapable of a Christian character and of Christian obligations—not only, we say, to refrain from doing this, but by all means in his power, and therefore, certainly, by all words that he can utter, to maintain and to propagate the belief that the society of the world has been redeemed from error and adopted into the Kingdom of God. If not, then we do not know what the words “The kingdom of this world is become our Lord’s and His Christ’s”* may signify. It is, therefore, with anxiety and regret that we hear any one deny to the Christianized society of Europe the character of a normal state, and that we hear any one whom we respect extol a state

* Apoc. xi. 15.

of political society in which it has ceased actively to conform itself to the unity of the Christian Faith.

The question whether democracy is certainly and rapidly advancing, is wholly irrelevant to the vital principle here at issue. Every form of government, monarchical, aristocratic, or democratic, may be perfectly legitimate. But whether a state be the most absolute of monarchies, or the most democratic of republics, its true relation towards religion is in principle precisely the same. Every one who possesses political power is under the indefeasible obligation of carefully looking to it that none of his political measures injure the people's spiritual good; and, moreover, he fulfils more faithfully the trust which he receives from God, in proportion as he makes their spiritual advancement his predominant end. Nor can we see any reason why such principles may not be as heartily accepted by the rulers of a republic as by an absolute monarch: at all events it is the business of good Catholics to labour in enforcing them. On the other hand, if (which God forbid!) we were really threatened with a new social development, of which the fundamental principle should be that the civil governor, as such, is indifferent to the people's religious good, such a social development would be in itself radically corrupt and unchristian, and a miserable declension even from our present condition. Against such a social development, when once its true character is rightly understood, every good Catholic would contend to the death. It is not, however, our purpose, as we have said, to pursue this subject further for the present. We will therefore notice only two other topics, and so conclude this brief account.

The one was the recommendation of the Congress to found Academies like that of the Catholic Religion in Rome. And it was not without satisfaction that we remembered that we, who are behind our continental brethren in so many things, are before them at least in this. For three years the Academia of the Catholic Religion, affiliated to that in Rome, has existed in the Diocese of Westminster, and has held its monthly meetings at the house of the Cardinal Archbishop. Its object is precisely that of the Congress; namely, to promote, not merely literary, or artistical, or æsthetical compositions, but the discussion and defence of the great constructive truths and principles of the Catholic religion and of Christian society. We earnestly hope that the members will give their minds with a renewed interest and vigour to this work, so necessary in England, where the very air we breathe is charged with anti-Catholic influences, and the intellect of our own people is insensibly warped and perverted.

The other topic which appeared prominently, and elicited at every mention a wonderful outbreak of enthusiasm, was the University of Louvain. It is well known that one of the causes of the Revolution of 1830 was the attempt of the Dutch government to establish anti-Catholic education in Belgium. The Catholic University of Louvain may be regarded as the trophy of victory, and as the citadel, stronger than that of Antwerp, to defend the liberties of Catholic Belgium. In the last thirty years a whole generation of Catholic men has been formed there, and sent out into every class and condition of the state. The intellectual culture of the Catholics in Belgium makes them capable of any duty or conflict to which they may be called. The Congress was full of the sons of Louvain; some six hundred were said to be present—seven hundred and seventy signed the address to the Sovereign Pontiff. It was proposed that they should found an association of those who had studied there, with a view to perpetuate and to diffuse the spirit of their Catholic education. Two hundred enrolled themselves on the first mention of the scheme. We were greatly impressed by the quality of the men reared at Louvain. They exhibited an intellectual culture and development, united with an ardent and courageous spirit, which seemed to us worthy of being taken as a pattern for Catholic laymen. One of the speakers said, happily, "A good Christian is a great citizen;" and his words truly describe the lay Catholics of Belgium. It was a fine sight to see young men of the world stand up in an assembly of many thousands, and speak of authority and obedience like bishops, of truth and faith like priests, of the salvation of souls like missionaries, and of the independence and sovereignty of the Holy See like the pontifical Zouaves, in whom we see existing before our eyes an example of Christian chivalry second to nothing in the history of the Church. We do not confine these remarks to the laity reared in the University of Louvain: they apply, in their proportion, to most of the laymen who took part in the Congress. They appeared to us to speak, not only as men of the world, but as Christians thoroughly penetrated with the teaching of the Church and of their pastors. Among those who addressed the public assemblies, were men of every calling in life—advocates, diplomatists, professors, private gentlemen—who spoke of the duties and dangers of life and of the world, with that tone of frank and manly piety which is so graceful and fitting in the mouth of laymen. When S. Ambrose exhorted the people of Milan to elect their bishop peacefully, he harangued so episcopally that they elected him by acclamation. We are told, too, that the

Emperor Valentinian took it as a compliment, that the men he chose for judges should be chosen by the people as their bishops. We deem the Belgians happy in having a race of laymen who count among them public men of the same type, and we should wish to see them multiplied among ourselves.

While we listened for five long days to the words of such men, we asked ourselves, when will England rear such a generation of Catholic youth? and will they be nurtured to this ardour and to these high instincts in the Protestant universities of Oxford and Cambridge? or when shall we possess a Louvain of our own? The subject of a Catholic university for England was often spoken of during that week among the members of the Congress; great interest was shown by many, and some of the foremost among them promised their help whensoever such a work shall be taken in hand. At the banquet which closed the Congress, the Rector of Louvain, Mgr. de Ram, after describing what the university had done for Belgium, expressed, amidst much acclamation, his ardent hope that the day would come when both Germany and England would possess their Catholic university. As English Catholics, we were sensibly moved by the charity and sympathy with which every mention of the Church in England was received; as, for instance, the proposal to found in England a Seminary for Foreign Missions; and, still more, the glowing picture of the state and progress of the Catholic Church in this country, as drawn by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. It was a noble discourse, which elicited a great response of sympathy with the Catholics of England. In the course of it, his Eminence, in a few courteous and respectful sentences, defined the limit within which he and others concurred in the principles which had been enunciated by certain of the speakers. He observed with much felicity, that the liberty which they had invoked gave him the freedom of limiting the measure of his adhesion to some of the eloquent discourses which had been delivered.

Essays and Miscellaneous Papers.

HISTORICAL NOTES OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

PART II.—*Tract 90: its Antecedents, Motives, Object, and immediate Results.*

I INTEND to devote this Paper to the subject of Tract 90; and it will not be otherwise than consistent with such intention if I speak, in the first instance, somewhat in detail, of a circumstance which is known to have produced a powerful impression upon Mr. Newman's mind, and to have affected, more or less, every work which he took in hand subsequently to its date. This circumstance belongs properly to the period of history comprehended in my last paper; and as we have thus overshot our mark, it will be necessary to take our train back some little way, in order the better to bring it up to the point of destination.

It must be very difficult for those who are sons of the Church, not by adoption but by inheritance, to realize, even by a strong effort of imagination, the depth and extent of the ignorance which prevailed among members of the Anglican Establishment at the beginning of the Tractarian movement, with regard to the state and feelings of the Catholic community in England. It is no exaggeration to say that many of us knew far more about the manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians, or Scythian tribes, than of the characters and doings of this portion of our fellow-countrymen. I have no reason to think that I was myself at all behind the general run of my contemporaries in the advantages of education, or in knowledge of the world; so that if I give you my own ideas, in early youth, of the subject in question, I think you may receive them as a fair sample of the average opinions of young people at the time. I thought that the "Roman Catholics" of England did not, at the most, number more than about 80 or 100 souls, who were distributed in certain great families over the midland and northern counties. I thought that each of these families lived in a large haunted house, embosomed in yew-trees, and surrounded by high brick walls. About the interior of these mansions I had also my ideas. I thought that they were

made up of vast dreary apartments, walled with tapestry ; with state bed-rooms, in which were enormous beds, with ebony bedsteads surmounted by plumes, and which only required horses to be put to them in order to become funeral cars. I fancied, of course, that there reigned around and within these abodes a preternatural silence, broken only by the flapping of bats and the screeching of owls. Of Catholic priests I had a far less distinct idea, and consequently an ampler field of conjecture. I knew only that they had their little suburban chapels, in which they perpetrated ineffable rites. The only token of humanity about them was rather of a pleasing character. It was the little modest presbytery by the side of the chapel, with its wicket by the road, and its narrow gravel walk, edged with neatly-trimmed box, leading up to the entrance ; and its little garden by the side, in which the combination of the *utile* and the *dulce* was so happily expressed by the union of pinks and sweet-peas with plants of a more homely and esculent character. But who and what were the inmates of these dwellings ? That they must be mortal was evident ; but how did they employ themselves ? They were never to be seen in public places, and if they ever went abroad, it must be in company with the aforesaid owls and bats, and other such shy and lucifugous creatures. Surely that could not be one of them whom we saw the other day working in his garden like a common labourer, or coming out of that poor little cottage, so meanly clad, with his hand on his breast, and his eyes on the ground ? Of course not ; for priests are always represented, in pictures and on the stage, as big men, with haughty looks and shaven crowns. Such, or not very different, were my early notions of English Catholics ; and the strange thing is that, although I have no reason to think that the subject was interdicted, somehow I never liked talking about it, or trying to clear up my notions by comparison with those of others. The subject never seemed to come up naturally, or to lie in any one's way.*

This may serve to explain, what otherwise must seem so strange, the way in which during the earlier years of the Tracts, the very existence of English Catholics appeared to be ignored in the controversial literature of the period. The

* My experience of priests was derived from Lichfield, where, on St. John's day, 1847, I had the happiness of celebrating Mass in the little "suburban chapel," and the privilege of becoming personally acquainted, for the first time, with the venerable Dr. Kirk, who had been priest of Lichfield during the whole period of my boyhood and youth, and for many years before.

silence about them did not, I really believe, arise from any feeling of indifference or contempt; except only in the case of one of the Tract writers,* who never hesitated to avow those sentiments. It was much rather that they came in no one's path. As a proof that the ignorance, to which I myself have confessed, continued even through a considerable part of my Oxford career, I may mention that I did not know the Rev. Mr. Newsham, the priest of Oxford, even by sight, till, in the year 1845, he received me into the Church. The only one among those who took part in the Tractarian Movement to whom that worthy priest was personally known, was Mr. Newman, who, on being appointed to the parish of S. Clement's, in which the Catholic chapel of Oxford was situated, laid claim (I have heard) to him as one of his parishioners. If this story be true, the tables ought to have been reversed, and were so some twenty years later.

Had this state of things been reciprocal, it is impossible to say how long the Tractarian Movement might have been in fulfilling its providential destiny. But it was not so. Towards the year 1838, the Tractarian leaders, at least their chief, became aware that an eye was upon them, tracking their steps, noting their errors and inconsistencies, and guiding them, when they least thought of it, to a higher truth. Between two minds on either side of the barrier, there had sprung up one of those mysterious affinities which are alike inexplicable by human cause, and independent of the ordinary channels of intercourse. These minds spoke with one another without direct contact, and even without any ostensible relationship. It was like one of those communications which are said to be held between the inhabitants of different worlds, the results of which are conveyed to the uninitiated company through the intervention of a privileged medium. The two authorized media which reflected the mysterious intercourse in question were the *DUBLIN REVIEW* and the *British Critic*. The second volume of the "Essays on Various Subjects,"† which were republished some years ago from the former of these periodicals, contains the series of Papers, on the one side, to which allusion has been made, and, among the rest, the essay on the Catholic and Anglican Churches to which Dr. Newman, since he became a Catholic, has attributed, in great measure, the change of opinion which just six years afterwards issued in his conversion.‡ It would occupy me too long to undertake

* The Rev. W. Palmer, of Worcester College.

† By his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. Dolman; 1853.

‡ Dedication of "Discourses to Mixed Congregations."

anything like a complete analysis of the argument of that celebrated paper; and to give a mere abridgment of it would be to do it an injustice. No one, I think, who reads it, as I have lately done for a second or third time, can feel any surprise at the impression which it is now known to have produced upon one of the greatest intellects which the world, perhaps, has ever known.

I have felt it a duty, with a view to my present task, to read over also the article on the "Catholicity of the English Church,"* which Mr. Newman put forth shortly after the publication of that on the "Catholic and Anglican Churches," and in reply to it. It is impossible, I think, to read that article, with the light which Dr. Newman's subsequent confession has thrown upon it, without discerning evident traces of the shock which his views had recently received. It may, of course, easily be represented by his enemies as a disingenuous attempt to palm upon his co-religionists a theory which he disbelieved. To myself it conveys no such impression. It is the work of one shaken, but not yet cast down; who, with an affectionate clinging to his position too strong to satisfy the wishes of those who longed to win him, combines an amount of fairness towards his antagonists, equally, or yet more unsatisfactory to those who longed with no less eagerness to retain him. It is, in fact, a balanced argument of that kind which pleases zealous adherents on neither side of a controversy, but which, for that very reason, is all the more genuine as the expression of a mind which "dotes yet doubts, suspects yet strongly loves."

To me there is something most beautiful in the way in which the author seems to oscillate between the evident bias of his intellectual tendencies and the no less evident attractions of his early faith. He seems to be thinking aloud; and his essay reads more like a confession than a didactic treatise. Throughout he is fearful of saying either too little or too much. Every strong statement he follows up with a qualification, or guards by a proviso. The whole result is, that the essay appears both weak in argument and undecided in tone. But its weakness and indecision are the fault, not of the author, but of his cause,—an honour to his heart, no discredit to his intellect. The reply to the special paper, which helped to demolish his theory, is contained in half a page, and reads almost like irony. No wonder this attempt failed to satisfy the devoted partisans of Anglicanism, and probably excited in the minds of many who, far from acknowledging the fact to

* *British Critic*, Jan. 1840.

others, scarcely liked to trust their own impressions of it, that their champion had shifted his ground, and entered upon a path of which no one could foresee the termination. Those who looked narrowly into the article could scarcely fail to observe that, in the imaginary dialogue between an Anglican and a Catholic, into which the author throws his controversy, he leaves the Catholic in possession of the field. This might not, of course, be the writer's intention; but straws show the direction of the wind. Mr. Newman, meanwhile, went about his work as before. It was only his most intimate friends who knew that any change had come over him. But as time went on, the fact became more perceptible. A thoroughly honest and sincere man cannot long keep such a secret, however much he may desire it. It oozes out in every natural expression of his character. In Mr. Newman it was soon betrayed by the tone of his sermons and his other writings. In "Loss and Gain" he somewhere describes this phase of the movement in his own amusing way:—"They say Smith is moving; he has changed his ground." At the time, however, it was a serious matter for every one. "Newman has had a shake," they said; in fact, he was an altered man. "*Hæsit lateri letalis arundo.*" It was the beginning of the end.

The "Tracts for the Times" had now proceeded, in periodical issues, from their first to their eighty-ninth number. Many of them had passed without much observation, but some few had given great offence to one or more parties in the Establishment, and been the occasion of much earnest controversy. In this number was Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism, which defended, with his usual learning, the doctrine of sacramental grace against the Low-Church and Latitudinarian parties. Things had also been said upon the other of the two sacraments which the Church of England professed to retain, of a nature to excite fears in the same quarters. But the two Tracts which created the greatest stir, and the objections to which were shared by many High Churchmen, were those of Mr. Isaac Williams on the "Theory of Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge," and that of Mr. Newman on the Broviary. The former of these essays was in the highest degree unpalatable to the Evangelicals, because it contained a scarcely concealed attack upon their practice of preaching the doctrine of the Atonement indiscriminately before all hearers. The same Tract was ill received, not merely by the Evangelical school, but by other parties also, because it propounded a theory of which none of them could foresee the results. "If religious knowledge," people said,

"is to be dispensed by gradual instalments, and as its disciples are able to bear it, who can tell what may be in 'reserve' for any of us as time goes on? Better, then, break off at once from these teachers than allow them to lead us blindfold over marsh and quagmire." The Tract on the Breviary went far to confirm these impressions. It seems to have drawn down the remonstrances of Dr. Bagot, the Bishop of Oxford, who was, in the main, very fair and generous in his dealings with the Tractarians; for, among the Tracts which Mr. Newman defends, in his published letter to that prelate, after the appearance of Tract 90, I find an important place given to this on the Breviary. It is to be lamented that in it even Mr. Newman was tempted to depart from that spirit of justice towards the Church which was on the whole characteristic of him. In the course of the Tract in question he strangely says that the principal attitude of Rome towards the ancient Liturgy of the Church was that of having corrupted it. To which the writer in the *Dublin Review* very naturally replies by asking, whether it were nothing to have prized and preserved it?

In the earlier part of 1841, eight years after the beginning of the movement, appeared the famous Tract 90. We are left at no loss to conjecture the motives which led Mr. Newman to take this critical and eventful step. He has fully explained them in his "Letter to Dr. Jelf."

"The Tract is grounded on the belief that the Thirty-nine Articles need not be so closed as the received method of teaching closes them, and ought not to be, for the sake of many persons. If we will close them, we run the risk of subjecting persons whom we should least like to lose, or distress, to the temptation of joining the Church of Rome and as to myself, I was led especially to exert myself with reference to this difficulty, from having had it earnestly urged upon me, by persons whom I revere, to do all I could to keep members of our own Church from straggling in the direction of Rome."*

The fall of a thunderbolt could hardly excite a greater sensation in its neighbourhood, than did these latter words in many quarters of the university and the country. It was like the "Ah, my lord, beware of jealousy,"—the first clothing in words of a dreaded, half-suspected, half-realized phantasy. Till this time, no one, except the very few who were in the secret, had even contemplated the possibility of such defections. "Tendencies to Rome" had indeed been freely

* Letter to Jelf, p. 27.

imputed to the Tracts. But many persons hardly knew their own meaning in such phrases; while those who did attach to them a meaning, had probably no more definite idea than that, some day or other, the proposals of Archbishop Wake might be revived; or, at all events, thought only of some great Romanizing demonstration within the Established Church. Individual conversions to Rome were at that time so uncommon, involved so serious a step, entailed such costly sacrifices, that ample securities against them were supposed to exist on every side. What, then, was the general amazement on finding that the leader of the movement himself, who must be supposed to know its secrets better than any one else, actually spoke, in a published document,—in an apology, too, where he would naturally use peculiar circumspection—of “straggling towards Rome” as not merely a possible, but a pressing contingency! Some indeed said, “They will be a good riddance.” But most men were wiser; and even those who thus spoke did not bring home to themselves the import of their words. At all events, “secession to Rome” became, from that moment, a practical fear and a popular cry.

Tract 90 is a commentary, not upon all the Thirty-nine Articles, but upon such of them only as appear, directly or by implication, to contradict certain Catholic doctrines. Their wording is in many places so extremely loose as to allow of their receiving the benefit of the doubt in favour of an orthodox interpretation. By dint of fixing upon their words meanings which were just admissible though anything rather than obvious, or of clearing up doubts from the language of other articles which was either explanatory or contradictory, and which it was more respectful to suppose the first rather than the second, the Tract contrived to squeeze out of this intractable and elusive formulæ a sense not absolutely fatal to the authority of the Church and the grace of certain sacraments. In the case of those Articles which undertake to deal with what they call “Romish doctrine” (in the original “*doctrina Romanensium*”), the writer considers that the framers meant to condemn, not formal definitions of the Church (the Council of Trent had not then spoken), but certain popular yet “authorized” interpretations of those definitions, to which the Church, in the abstract, viewed as a dogmatic teacher, was not formally committed. He thus seemed to himself able to vindicate, on behalf of the Established Church, a certain doctrine on Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, &c., which was at any rate, he maintained, the doctrine of Antiquity, and might even be that of the Tridentine Decrees, apart from the aforesaid popular or traditionary

interpretation of those Decrees ; or, in other words, provided only that such doctrine were not what the Articles meant by "*doctrina Romanensium*," it might be held consistently with an honest subscription to them.

Whether or not the framers of the Articles intended, consciously or implicitly, to admit such a distinction between abstract definitions and popular teaching, it is impossible, at this distance of time, to determine ; though it is historically certain that they could not have had the Council of Trent, at all events, in their eye. The supposition was, at any rate, discreditable either to their theological acumen or to their ingenuousness. Mr. Newman chose the former alternative ; Mr. Ward seemed to prefer the latter. The view which Mr. Ward apparently adopted, was that the English Reformers had two strings to their bow : the one, to satisfy their friends abroad ; the other, to avoid offending, more than was necessary, the Catholic party in England. This general object they sought to attain by giving the Articles as Protestant an aspect as consisted with leaving certain loopholes through which Catholics, or at least the more Catholic-minded of the clergy, might creep in. Another person * wrote a pamphlet to prove historically that some such compromise was highly probable in fact. Mr. Newman appeared to take a middle course, and to avoid all open imputations upon the honesty of the English Reformers. He supposed them to have been rather diplomatic than dishonest. He spoke of the Articles as the same sort of compromise which would result from two very different parties having to draw up a petition to Parliament, or other such public document, in which each side would have to secure a certain recognition of its own views by insisting largely upon the use of an ambiguous phraseology.

It is a fact, though almost an incredible one, that Mr. Newman was totally unprepared for the reception which this most remarkable essay encountered both in the university and throughout the country. This fact, which I state with unhesitating confidence, is a sufficient proof, if any can be necessary, of the perfect simplicity and honesty with which he undertook and executed his task. He most conscientiously believed that the interpretation of the Articles which he proposed, however new and however little consistent, in some parts at least, with their *primâ facie* aspect, was yet fairly attributable to them. And he expressed the greatest surprise when a friend, to whom he showed his Tract previously to publication, gave it as his opinion (entirely borne out by the result), that it would com-

* [Mr. Oakeley himself.—EDITOR.]

pletely electrify the university and the Church. With characteristic prudence, Mr. Newman so far acted upon this opinion as to take the advice of another friend upon the question of publishing the Tract; and as that friend did not appear to share the expectations of the other, or, at all events, considered that the object justified the risk, the author committed his manuscript to the press.

Tract 90 had not been out many days before the University of Oxford was in a fever of excitement. It was bought with such avidity that the very presses were taxed, almost beyond their powers, to meet the exigencies of the demand. Edition followed edition by days rather than by weeks, and it was not very long before Mr. Newman realized money enough, by the sale of this shilling pamphlet, to purchase a valuable library. If, during the month which followed its appearance, you had happened to enter any common room in Oxford between the hours of six and nine in the evening, you would have been safe to hear some ten or twenty voices eloquent on the subject of Tract 90. If you had happened to pass two heads of houses, or tutors of colleges, strolling down High Street in the afternoon, or returning from their walk over Magdalen Bridge, a thousand to one but you would have caught the words "Newman," and "Tract 90." Nor was it many days before action was taken upon the question. Four gentlemen, tutors of their respective colleges, came forward as the representatives of the great body of their order, with a manifesto, in the course of which they stated that they were "at a loss to see what security would remain, were the principles of the Tract generally recognized; that the most plainly erroneous doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome might now be inculcated in the lecture-rooms of the university and from the pulpits of our churches." It is worthy of record that of these four gentlemen, one was the present Bishop of London, and another the Rev. Henry Bristow Wilson, one of the writers in the volume of "Essays and Reviews," who has himself, within the last year, been a defendant in the Ecclesiastical Court. This document was not put forth many hours before Mr. Newman was again in the field with a reply to it in the form of the "Letter to Dr. Jelf" previously noticed in this paper. The sharpness of the contest is indicated by the extraordinary rapidity and vigour of the various movements. Tract 90, though dated (rather ominously) on the Feast of the Conversion of S. Paul, was not actually published till an early day in March. Yet, on the 13th of that month, as appears by the date, Mr. Newman sent his letter to Dr. Jelf to the printer; and by that time the manifesto of the Four Tutors had been

not only published but acted upon; for, at the end of Mr. Newman's reply to it, there appears the following characteristic foot-note:—"Since the above was in type, it has been told me that the Hebdomadal Board has recorded its opinion about the Tract." The Hebdomadal Board, it may be necessary to say, consisted at that time of the body of heads of colleges and halls, who possessed initial power in the legislation of the university, but whose acts had no weight excepting as declarations of individual opinion, till they had been promulgated, and ratified by the vote of the academical convocation. This will account for the very mild way in which Mr. Newman notices the strictures which that board had thus early passed upon his work. The effect of the whole transaction was, that Mr. Newman's Tract was never condemned by the university, nor he himself formally precluded from the exercise of any office, whether academical or clerical. He withdrew, of his own accord, certain expressions in the Tract which were nowise essential to its subject, but never made, as he distinctly states in his letter to Dr. Jelf, any retraction of it. It is remarkable that he should have escaped public condemnation and penalty, especially when we consider that, merely for a sermon in which the interpretation of the Tract was adopted, and not without qualification, upon a single point of doctrine, Dr. Pusey was afterwards condemned by a committee of six doctors, and inhibited from preaching before the university for two years. But Oxford did not forget the Tract; and, four years afterwards, collected the slumbering embers of its indignation, too fierce to be any longer repressed, in its onslaught on Mr. Ward.

Dr. Pusey's moderation did much valuable service to the movement. He was, as Mr. Newman was not, a high dignitary of the Established Church. He was also a person of aristocratic birth and connections; and, although one of the last men in the world to set store by such accidental advantages, yet, in an Established Church closely allied to the world, and affected, however unconsciously, by its spirit, such considerations could not fail to have their influence. Moreover, as I said in my last paper, Dr. Pusey was the only leader of the Tractarian school to whom the Evangelical party had any kind of attraction. His piety was not only most real, but it was of a popular and impressive character. He had also a way peculiarly his own, and entirely consistent with sincerity and simplicity, of rounding off the sharp edges of the strong and offensive statements of others, and thus presenting them under a far less odious aspect to those who disliked them. Hence, Dr. Pusey had a definite and most important place in the

movement. While it was Mr. Newman's office to stimulate, and his misfortune to startle, to Dr. Pusey, on the other hand, belonged the work of soothing, and the ministry of conciliation. He was the S. Barnabas of the movement. Yet the effect of his character, and of his conciliatory spirit was less perceptible in the university than elsewhere. A writer in the *British Critic** throws some light upon that prejudice, so far, at least, as the action of the "Six Doctors" is an instance of it. On the whole, however, there can be no doubt of the service rendered to Tractarianism by the learning, piety, moderation, high character, and elevated position of this remarkable and estimable man. Indeed, it deserves to be recorded how much of the success of the work was due to the spirit of generosity, forbearance, and mutual confidence which prevailed among all its great originators. It is certain that Dr. Pusey did not fully sympathize with every view of Mr. Newman, or, at all events, with the mode in which he occasionally expressed himself. It is scarcely less certain that Mr. Newman could not always go along with the arguments by which Dr. Pusey defended him. Had there been less of loyalty on the one side, or of affection on both, these differences might easily have been exaggerated into causes of disunion, in which case the whole success of the work would, humanly speaking, have been at an end. It is, of course, possible to attribute these results to the spirit of compromise, or the arrangements of diplomacy. All I can do is to express my own belief that the view I have taken of them, as it is the more charitable, is also the truer. It was one of the characteristic differences between these two eminent men, that Dr. Pusey was far more dogmatical in the direction of consciences than Mr. Newman. He always seemed much surer of his ground; and, as positive teaching and authoritative direction were just what thoughtful Anglicans wanted, he was in great request as a spiritual guide. He even undertook, it was commonly said, people's conscientious burdens, and made himself responsible for the consequences. Mr. Newman, on the other hand, was, even as a Protestant, most diffident of himself and unwilling to decide for others. Yet, it is remarkable that in real influence over others there was no comparison between the two. Dr. Pusey's power over consciences was limited by the degree of his disciples' obedience; Mr. Newman's penetrated and swayed them in spite both of themselves and of himself. He ruled them without aiming at rule; and they acted under his influence while scarcely aware of his power. His words were treasured up as

* July, 1843; p. 197.

oracles; his hints were improved into laws; his very looks and gestures watched as a mirror of his thoughts; his latent feelings tenderly consulted, his wishes reverently anticipated, even his very peculiarities unconsciously copied. His personal influence in the Church of England was something to which experience suggests hardly a parallel. Yet, according to the paradoxical law upon which real influence seems to depend, the ratio of its extent appeared to be inverse with the degree in which it was sought. In "Loss and Gain," he has recorded the facts of the case, as if from an external point of view.

"Dr. Pusey," said Charles, "is said always to be decisive. He says, 'This is Apostolic;' 'that's in the Fathers.' 'S. Cyprian says this;' 'S. Augustine decrees that:' 'this is safe;' 'that is wrong.'" . . . "But the Puseyites are not always so distinct," said Sheffield; "there's Smith; he never speaks decidedly on difficult questions." . . . "Then he won't have many followers," said Charles, "that's all." "But he has more than Dr. Pusey," answered Sheffield. "Well, I can't understand it," said Charles; "he ought not; perhaps they won't stay." "The truth is," said Sheffield, "I suspect he is more of a sceptic at bottom." *

Among the effects of Tract 90 it must be mentioned that Dr. Bagot, who was Mr. Newman's ecclesiastical superior, sent a message to him stating that, in his opinion, the Tracts for the Times were doing mischief, and ought to be given up. Mr. Newman unhesitatingly acted upon this suggestion, and the Tracts for the Times accordingly expired in their 90th number. Mr. Newman announced his intention of withdrawing them, in a published letter to Dr. Bagot, in which, without undertaking to defend, he feels it quite consistent with his duty to explain, such of the Tracts as had given the greatest umbrage to that prelate.

It deserves to be recorded that Mr. Ward, whose name now begins to occupy a prominent place in the history of that time, wrote two pamphlets in defence of Tract 90, distinguished by great moderation of tone, under the titles of "A Few Words," and "A Few More Words." An important point was gained in these publications by showing that the Homilies, which form the best extant commentary upon the Articles, evidently point at certain views of "Romish doctrine," which never were, and never could have been, sanctioned by the authority of the Church. Such, for instance, is that which attributes to the Saints and the Blessed Virgin (whom the Tractarians persisted in calling "S. Mary") the honour

* "Loss and Gain," c. xiv.

due to God alone. Such also is some imaginary view of Purgatory which supersedes the doctrine of eternal punishment. We, who speak from within the Church, know full well how absolutely monstrous are such suppositions. But Mr. Newman, at the time he wrote the Tract, was under the impression that these and such like frightful corruptions, or rather contradictions, of Divine Truth were extensively countenanced by what he calls the "authoritative teaching" of the Church, both in the sixteenth century and afterwards; meaning by that phrase the teaching of living authorities beside and beyond her recorded definitions.*

As I am anxious to place on record so much of the history of Tractarianism as may be necessary for the explanation of facts and phenomena which must enter into the future ecclesiastical annals of this country, I have been obliged to go into details which I fear must be very uninteresting to many Catholics. Hence it is, that, for my own relief as well as theirs, I am prepared to seize upon the lighter and more ludicrous features of the movement. Accordingly I shall not hesitate to wind up my present Paper, by presenting an aspect of Tractarianism which is historically certain, though it is absolutely impossible to describe it in its true colours without the appearance of burlesque. I allude to the prospects which about this time many sanguine persons began to entertain of a corporate union between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Establishment. A very few words will show how naturally these hopes would arise as a consequence of the Tract which has formed the subject of this Paper.

Persons who, before the appearance of Tract 90, had been inclined to suspect that the Church was right, and the Establishment wrong, had conceived but of one mode whereby their conscientious difficulties might be surmounted, should those difficulties persevere and become inveterate—that of submitting to the Church one by one. The Thirty-nine Articles, so far from offering to facilitate any other course, were looked upon as the most serious obstacle to union. They constituted the very charter of the "Church of England," to give up which would be like surrendering its existence. Now, however, a rope was thrown out from the very quarter whence it was least expected. Had persons looked narrowly into the Tract upon which they founded their new hopes, they would have seen that it did not really furnish any basis of

* It may be noticed as a striking fact, that, in the Established Church, which rejects Purgatory, the doctrine of the Eternity of Future Punishments is now extensively denied.

reconciliation between the two bodies. "Here," says Mr. Newman in his "Letter to Dr. Jelf," "is one Roman doctrine which the Articles do not warrant,—Infallibility." There was also another which lay at the root of the whole question—the supremacy of S. Peter's See. The doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist was, in Mr. Newman's opinion, another insuperable difficulty, though Mr. Ward undertook, and with great apparent reason, to show that the Catholic dogma on that subject was as admissible upon the principle of interpretation set forth in the Tract as any other. But as the Tract was caught at in its general drift, rather than thoughtfully investigated, visions of unity began to flit before many a simple and zealous soul. "Perhaps, after all," they said, "the Church of England might not object to give up the Articles; and even if she retained them, they would still serve as a valuable protest against those traditionary corruptions and practical errors against which no Formulary of Faith can speak more strongly than the Decrees of Trent themselves. Trent and the Articles would stand side by side as two kindred witnesses against error; meanwhile, Trent would proclaim to the world those truths which the Articles do not explicitly condemn (forbid the thought!), and, therefore, of course, implicitly recognize. It is only, after all, one Faith under two aspects; Trent is the stronger in its witness to the Truth, England in its disclaimers of corruption; but the Truth which Trent proclaims England does not disavow; and the errors against which England so loudly protests Trent does not shrink from admitting to be such; nay, does not hesitate to denounce."

That such dreams should have a tendency to fascinate and to delude, can be matter of surprise to no one who reflects how the process of a corporate union would have tended to obviate all the most appalling difficulties which hampered the course of individual conversion. With men like many of those who took part in the movement, the very least of these difficulties was the sacrifice of income and social position. But there was, in fact, no temporal obstacle which would not have vanished before the brilliant project which, not merely haunted our imaginations, but was actually the subject of serious, or, at any rate, earnest deliberation.

There was one obstacle to the success of the plan, which certainly did not receive the consideration it deserved. We had, as the phrase runs, "our own consent" to the transaction, but forgot that to every contract two parties are necessary. Never was there a more delightful prospect, nor a more magnificent scheme—in the eyes of its projectors.

The First Napoleon mapping out England on the eve of his proposed invasion, and assigning Belvoir Castle to one of his generals, Arundel to another, and Lulworth to a third, was as nothing compared with the distribution of other men's property, the over-riding of other men's rights, and the arrangement of other men's temporal and spiritual affairs, in which these amiable enthusiasts found it easy to indulge. Such bishops and deans as had the good fortune to be celibate would be ready to drop into the ancient sees, or to take the headships of the restored abbeys. The married clergy would be a greater difficulty. But bishops and regulars might be expected to separate from their wives, and those wives to pass naturally into the religious state. The secular clergy need not be molested for the present. In the normal state of things they, too, must be celibate, but "vested interests" might be respected for the moment, and the existing generation of wives suffered to die out.

It is almost unnecessary to say that Mr. Newman himself never entered into these views otherwise than by laughing at them. But, in his "Letter to Dr. Jelf," he distinctly refers to them; and in "Loss and Gain" has exposed them in that vein of brilliant and kindly wit which is peculiar to himself. They served to amuse many excellent persons for a considerable space of time, and had this undoubted advantage, that they dispelled, once for all, the prospect of a union which could only at last have verified the poet's image :—

Mortua quinetiam jungebant corpora vivis.

The mists of theory melted away, and left in its stern reality the only alternative of duty—individual submission.

In my next paper I must shift the scene to London for the purpose of introducing an episode, or by-plot. But I intend returning to Oxford and its neighbourhood before I conclude, in order that we may wind up our story at the point from which we started.

(*To be continued.*)

Notices of Books.

Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects ; with an Introduction on the Relations of England to Christianity. By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. Dublin : Duffy.

THIS is the most important Catholic work of the quarter, so far at least as our own country is concerned. It is chiefly made up of sermons delivered at very wide intervals—and indeed it is somewhat remarkable that F. Manning has preached at each of the three English provincial synods,—yet the identity of thought and spirit throughout is very striking. Nor can this be accounted for by the fact that the sermons have been selected for the very reason of their agreeing in subject ; nothing will explain it except the singular steadiness and fixedness of thought, which we should be disposed to regard as the author's distinguishing characteristic. This fixedness of thought is by no means confined to his Catholic career. On the whole, we should say that while there is certainly no convert who has been more thoroughly acclimatized in his new position, yet there is no one in whom the Catholic intellectual life has been so simply a development of the pre-Catholic. He has thought throughout on the basis of one fundamental principle, and when that principle reached a certain degree of expansion, it carried him, as it were, spontaneously into the Catholic Church. This principle is stated at length in the Introduction to the present volume (p. 24) ; and the passage will repay the reader's most careful attention. In substance, of course, it is as old as the Apostles ; but the particular form in which F. Manning has exhibited it, is, so far as we are aware, entirely new. The principle to which we refer is the Pentecostal institution of Christ's mystical body the Church. He shows attention to the fact that, according to even the highest non-Catholic theories, the Church is on her *probation* ; that she may fall away from her privileges and from her fulness of union with Christ (p. 20)—a notion contrary to the plainest testimonies of Scripture, nay, to the elementary idea of the Church, as there exhibited. And he also points out (p. 19) the remarkable analogy which exists between the office of God the Son, as manifested in a natural body, and the office of God the Holy Ghost, as animating the mystical body.

From this great principle, in proportion as it is studied and pondered, two great inferences result, which may be called our author's dominant ideas. The first of these is the immeasurable elevation of the Papal Throne over all other earthly dignities. The second is the extreme importance of European society being in union with, and subjection to, the Church ; a consummation which of course has never been attained in a degree at all commensur le

with the reason of the case, but at which it is certainly not less important to aim at the present than at any previous period. F. Manning is hence led to say some severe things on "nationalism," but not more severe than true. "When Judaism passed away," he observes, "nationalism became a heresy within the kingdom of God. It is the mark of heresy to be national and local, as it is of the one universal kingdom to know of no distinction of nations. They are absorbed in the unity of the true kingdom" (p. 249). And whereas to our own mind there is no feature in our author's works so attractive as the emphatic repudiation of nationalism, it is the expression of this unreserved loyalty of heart and affection to the Holy See which seems, as might perhaps have been expected, specially to jar on the ear of Protestants. The *Reader*, an excellently-conducted paper of recent origin, speaks of F. Manning as having at length openly declared himself, in the same kind of tone as though he had confessed to a taste for cannibalism; and even as we write we observe that the *Guardian* speaks of "the extreme convert school, that of Faber and Manning," as "positively revolting both to the taste and to the conscience of honest men" (September 9th, p. 856). The *Guardian* does not indeed explain what are the particular features of this "convert school" which thus excite its indignation; but, after reading F. Manning's pages, so characterized by dignity and self-command, we are not a little startled by such declamations as those we have just quoted, which are not less "revolting" to our "conscience" than our tenets can possibly be to the writer in question.

Our author's controversy, however, though entirely free from asperity or personal invective, is very direct and telling. His whole Introduction, after the preliminary statement of principle to which we have adverted, is devoted to a vigorous criticism of the Establishment in its doctrinal aspect. Nor have we anywhere seen the contrast between Catholicism and Anglicanism more pointedly stated than where he says that "every error which has sprung up in the Anglican Church adheres to it still. *Its doctrines vanish, its heresies abide.* All its morbid humours are absorbed into its blood" (p. 57).

There is one part of nationalism from which, strange to say, we doubt whether F. Manning has been altogether emancipated. He seems to express himself here and there (see, e.g., page 73) as though he regarded the Anglo-Saxon as naturally the noblest of races, however depressed and depraved by the religious corruption in which it is plunged. For ourselves, corporately, we seek to represent with perfect impartiality both Celt and Saxon, and may be said therefore to have no nation. But we do strongly think that every race has extremely great faults, and that each one of us, as an individual, is so far at least bound up with those faults, that to attempt to form an impartial comparison between our own countrymen and foreigners is simply absurd. We had better let it alone altogether, fix our thoughts on the faults of our own national character, and strive to correct them.

By far the most interesting single sermon in the volume, though its subject is less connected than the rest with its author's pervading line of thought, is the ninth on S. Charles. It should be read again and again, both as a whole and in its various parts; for a more striking picture has never been exhibited. We select one long passage for extraction, because in England at the present

time there seems so unusually good an opening for the introduction of lay agency:—

“He founded the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine—of men for boys, and of women for girls, which continues vigorous and efficient to this day. The constitution of this Confraternity was co-extensive with the diocese. It consisted of a supreme council under the direction of a priest, resident in Milan, and responsible only to himself. The other officers were laymen; a prior and sub-prior, with consultors and visitors, and other inferior officers. In every parish a similar council was established. To these were added a body of catechists and of *pescatori*, as he called them, or fishermen, whose office it was to traverse the whole city, especially on the festivals; to enter places of amusement, the haunts of sin, as well as the streets and the piazzas of the city; and not only to admonish and to warn, but actually to bring the young and the old, the children and the adults, to receive instruction, or to prepare for the Sacraments. Every month the council of each parish reported its progress to the superior council, by which a monthly report was laid before S. Charles in person. The visitors of the supreme council continually went their rounds from parish to parish, to keep alive the zeal and the industry of the officers and teachers. At his death, S. Charles left behind him by this one Confraternity upwards of 700 schools, 275 superior officers, 1,726 inferior officers, 3,040 catechists, and 40,000 scholars. I have seen this system in vigorous action in the Church of the Oblate Fathers, at Rhò. On Sundays the nave of the church is curtained off, and subdivided for the classes, which are five in number, varying from children to adults; each have their special teachers; and office-bearers are appointed to go to and fro to maintain order and attention. It is to be remembered that the whole of this extensive and efficient system is composed of laymen, into whom S. Charles inspired somewhat of his own patient toil and burning zeal for souls. I may say that he created them for this work, and called them into existence to be the fellow-helpers of his pastoral care.”

There is one feature in this sermon which has diverted us not a little. The preacher begins by saying (p. 312) that he certainly shall not be tempted “to extol S. Charles by comparison or by contrast with other saints;” and he then proceeds in the very next page to compare him with S. Ignatius and S. Philip after this fashion: “In S. Ignatius we see the intellect; . . . in S. Philip the heart; . . . but in S. Charles we see the will, that *which governs both heart and intellect*.” We are far from saying this in the way of objection. We should no more think it a fault in the member of a Congregation that he thinks too highly by comparison of its Patron, than we should think it a fault in an affectionate son that he thinks too highly by comparison of his own parents; and we would submit this obvious suggestion to the consideration of many who have been so ready with censure or ridicule in regard to F. Faber’s strong language about S. Philip.

Returning to the volume before us, we should recommend our readers to study these sermons one by one, and at intervals. If they read the volume consecutively, they may be somewhat repelled by a certain sameness of thought which pervades it. But if they return to it at intervals, they will peruse each sermon with fresh interest, and become, even unconsciously, more and more imbued with those deep and all-important truths which have possession of the writer’s mind.

Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum ; sive Novum Testamentum cum Epistola Barnabæ et Fragmentis Pastoris a Codice Sinaitico, accuratè descripsit A. F. C. TISCHENDORF. Lipsiæ. 1863.

FOLLOWING the example that has already been given with regard to the Vatican and Alexandrine manuscripts, Dr. Tischendorf has published, for the convenience of the students of the Greek Testament, this portion of the celebrated manuscript which now goes by the name of Sinaitic. As some account has already been given, in a former publication, by the same author, of some of the chief features of this great Biblical treasure, we need hardly enter at any great length upon them at present. Dr. Tischendorf first caught a sight of it, as it appears, nearly twenty years ago. While on a visit to the monastery of S. Catherine, in 1844, he was shown some loose sheets of ancient writing, in a basket, thrown aside, apparently, as useless—or, probably, already condemned to the flames as soon as there should be occasion for them. He obtained a few sheets, which he at once recognized as part of a very ancient manuscript of the Septuagint, and, after vainly endeavouring to possess himself of more, he returned with his prize to Europe. He visited the monastery again in 1853, but could find no more traces of the remainder of the Codex on which his heart was set. He was more successful in the beginning of 1859, when he went again to the East, armed with strong recommendations, as a sort of envoy from the Emperor of Russia. He was shown the rest of the Codex, as far as it existed, containing a great part of the Old Testament, the whole of the New Testament, with the Epistle of Barnabas, and a part of the Shepherd of Hermas. He obtained leave to have it sent to him at Cairo, to which city he was returning, provided the Superiors there gave permission, and to transcribe it. This he accordingly did, with great diligence ; but this did not satisfy him. He suggested to the authorities of the convent that he should be commissioned by them to present the manuscript itself, in their names, to the Emperor of Russia. They were willing ; but at the time there was a vacancy in the archiepiscopal see, and they had to wait till it was filled up, for the proper authorization. Towards the end of the year it was given, and Dr. Tischendorf returned in triumph to lay his precious acquisition at the feet of the Emperor. It has since been printed with great care, and in magnificent style, as far as possible in facsimile, at the Emperor's expense ; but we must pass over the account given by Dr. Tischendorf of all the difficulties he has had to contend with in the process. We have before us all that is accessible to the ordinary student—a handsome quarto, printed in ordinary Greek type, but in other respects preserving exactly the lines and columnar form on each page, of the original. The publication is, of course, limited to the New Testament, except that we have, besides, the Epistle of St. Barnabas and the portion of the Pastor contained in the Codex.

Although an attempt has been made to cast discredit upon the Sinai manuscript, by proclaiming it a clever forgery, there seems to be a universal agreement amongst the learned, that the charge is to be dismissed at once as entirely unworthy of attention. We proceed, therefore, to give a short

account of some of the more prominent characteristics of the Codex. Dr. Tischendorf supposes it to show signs of as many as four different scribes, who, however, were contemporaries, and appear merely to have divided the labour. It has also been corrected in many thousand places, the earliest of the correctors not being far posterior in date to the original transcribers. It has but scanty interpunctuation, and, of course, it is exceedingly difficult to determine whether, in any particular case, this interpunctuation is to be attributed to the correctors or to the original writers. It has also marginal numbers, which indicate references to the sections of Ammonius and the canons of Eusebius. The writing is of such a kind as to furnish one of the chief arguments for the great antiquity of the manuscript. It is of the most ancient uncial character, as nearly as possible similar to that used on the papyrus rolls found in Herculaneum. In the magnificent volumes which contain the imperial reprint of the whole Codex, Dr. Tischendorf has given ocular demonstration of this assertion, by plates containing fac-similes of some of the most ancient specimens of writing, either on papyrus or parchment. One papyrus roll, found in 1853, in the Necropolis at Memphis, has writing exactly like that of the Codex. The oldest parchment writings represented in these plates are taken from the Vatican manuscript and a fragment of the Octateuch of Origen preserved at St. Petersburg. These two, among the specimens that Dr. Tischendorf has been able to produce, are the nearest in character to the present manuscript; though he has not given any that are, apparently, later than the fifth century. The quaternions of columns in each page are also cited by him as a sign of great antiquity, a similar feature in the Vatican manuscript (which, however, has but three columns in a page) having been accepted generally as an argument in the same direction. Such a feature marks an early stage of the transition from rolls to books. The very ancient orthography and the arrangement of the books, by which the Acts are placed after the Epistles of St. Paul, which is found nowhere but in the very early Syriac version, furnish other indications. The Codex agrees with the Vatican, and with the Vatican alone, among the manuscripts which claim great antiquity, in not having the "chapters" of the Gospels, which are known to have existed before the time of Eustathius. It agrees with the same manuscript in other points which seem also to indicate great antiquity. Thus, we know from Eusebius and S. Jerome, that in their time almost all the best copies omitted the last twelve verses of the Gospel of S. Mark. Yet all the existing MSS. of the fifth and sixth centuries, and, of course, all others still later, as well as the Vulgate and other versions, contain the verses in question. The Vatican and Sinai manuscripts alone omit them. Another instance of the same agreement between these two manuscripts, while differing from all others, is found in the beginning of the Epistle to the "Ephesians." The words *ἐν Εφεσῶν*, we are informed by S. Basil, were wanting in the older manuscripts in his time, and it appears that Origen omitted them also. Yet no manuscripts now existing leave out the words, except the two in question. It is the same with regard to the insertion of the name of the prophet Isaias in Matt. xiii. 35, which was made the ground of an objection by Porphyry, in the third century, and seems afterwards to have been removed from the text. The Sinaitic and Cambridge manuscripts

are, in the same way, almost alone in retaining the reading *ὅτε δὲ ἀναβαίνω* instead of *ὅπου*, in John vii. 8, which was also made use of by Porphyry; and they are quite alone in having another ancient reading, mentioned by Origen and others, of *ἐστὶ* instead of *ἦν*, in the fourth verse of St. John's first chapter ("in ipso vita erat"). The Sinaitic Codex alone preserves the reading mentioned by S. Ambrose, on Luke vii. 35, as being, in his day, that of "most of the Greeks"—*ἐργων* instead of *τεκνων*. There are several other instances, besides these, in which writers of the third or fourth centuries mention, as common in their days, readings which have not been found in any existing manuscript but this, and occasionally in one or two others. One of these, in which this manuscript stands *alone*, is a striking reading of a very important verse, John vi. 51: *ὁ ἀπὸς ὃν ἐγὼ ὠσσω ὑπερ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς ἢ σαρξ μου ἐστίν*. This reading agrees exactly with a quotation of Tertullian, and of the author of the "Speculum." We must refer our readers to the pages of Dr. Tischendorf's "Introduction" for more evidence of this kind. He has given three long lists of readings—1st, those which the Sinaitic Codex has, in common only with the Vatican, or some two or three others of the most ancient existing manuscripts; 2nd, those in which it differs even from them, but which are confirmed by the testimony of ancient Fathers or versions; and, 3rd, those in which it stands alone. And we need hardly do more than allude, for the sake of completeness, to the already well-known fact that it is on the side of antiquity with regard to several celebrated passages which are absent, generally, in the oldest manuscripts. Such is the simple reading, *ἐτεκεν υἱόν*, in Matt. i. 25—the words *αὐτῆς τοῦ πρωτοτοκου*, being left out. Such is the passage at the beginning of John viii., about the woman taken in adultery; the accounts of the Ascension, Mark xvi. 9, seq.; and Luke xxiv. 51; and, of course, the controverted verse in 1 John v. All these are omitted in this manuscript, in some cases with the concurrence of all very old monuments; and in every case with, at least, a very large amount of ancient testimony in favour of the omission. We need hardly say that we are far from thinking it clearly proved that the absence of these passages from the earliest existing MSS. is decisive, even on purely critical grounds, of the question whether they belong to the inspired text or not. But the agreement of this Codex with all those of the highest antiquity as to this point proves it to belong to the same early period.

Dr. Tischendorf's opinion seems to be, that the manuscript before us was derived from the same source as the Vatican manuscript, with which it so often agrees. He seems even to prefer it to the latter. It may have come from Alexandria to the monastery of S. Catherine, at the very time of its foundation by Justinian.

Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres du Nouveau Testament. Par REITHMAYR, HUG, THOLUCK, etc. Traduite et annotée par DE VALROGER, Prêtre de l'Oratoire de l'Immaculée Conception. Paris : Lecoffre & Cie.

M. VALROGER has put together a work very useful in itself, and for which a great need existed. No satisfactory book of the kind was to be found in France before his publication; and though he has been forced to betake himself to foreign sources for his present volume, they give us good reason to hope that the path of critical study on which he invites his readers to enter, will not remain untrodden by his countrymen for the future. For us in England his book is also a considerable boon. Things might be worse with us than they are; for although criticism has been left of late to the Protestants among us, the translations from German sources have been, to a great extent, made from among the least objectionable of the writers of that land of scholarship, and the edition of the New Testament completed not long since by the Dean of Canterbury, leans also to the more orthodox side among the German critics. Still, with either Dr. Alford, Dr. Wordsworth, or Dr. Davidson, whose "Introduction to the New Testament" has many high merits, we are in the hands of enemies, and are often reminded of the fact by themselves. M. Valroger's work may hardly supply all that we want, but at all events it is a great gain, and may serve to sharpen the appetite for something better, as well as stimulate the exertions which may produce it.

The two volumes before us aim at supplying, in some measure, both a general Introduction to the New Testament, and special introductions to the particular books that compose it. The greater part is translated from Dr. Reithmayr's "Introduction to the New Testament," published in 1852. From this source is derived the General Introduction, which occupies most of the first volume. After this we have two dissertations from Hug, on the Authenticity of the Books of the New Testament, and on the Certitude of the Gospel History. The remainder of the volume is occupied by a dissertation taken from M. Lehir's notice of the ancient Syriac version of the Gospels, discovered and edited a few years ago by Dr. Cureton, and by a collection of valuable notes. The second volume gives us the Special Introduction to each book, translated from Reithmayr, and contains also Tholuck's dissertation on the Credibility of the Gospel History.

We are inclined to think that the first volume is the more valuable of the two. Dr. Reithmayr's General Introduction is concise, but very lucid and interesting. It embraces the history of the formation of the Canon in the Catholic Church, its authority, and the guarantees for its authenticity; the history of the text, the various classes of manuscripts, the origin of various readings, the revisions attempted from time to time; and, finally, a very interesting account of the printed text from its beginnings under Ximenes and Erasmus, down to the last labours of Lachmann and Tischendorf. Another section gives us a similar account of the various ancient versions. Dr. Reithmayr's remarks on the history of the printed text are well worthy of notice. He thinks that the predominance of the Byzantine text, which has

obtained almost up to the present day in Europe, is in a great measure owing to the accident that, in the great work of Ximenes, the Complutensian Polyglott, the text of the New Testament was taken principally from manuscripts of that family. Erasmus had no manuscripts of any importance on which to ground his text. Robert Estienne (Stephanus) had more original sources, for the Paris library possessed some valuable MSS. ; but he was not himself critic enough to use them with judgment. Beza, who followed him, made some changes in the printed text, but not always with good reason ; and in the first half of the seventeenth century we come to those celebrated printers, the Elzevirs of Leyden, who published one of Estienne's editions with some of Beza's various readings ; and by the beauty of their type and handiness of their volumes, imposed "the Received Text" upon the learned world of Europe, whether Catholic or Protestant. We pass on through a number of writers who either simply repeated this received text, or, if they consulted original sources, rather prepared the way for improvement than effected it themselves—such as Walton, Fell, Mill, Kuster, Gerhard. At length the great Bengel rose, and raised the standard of independence. He divided the manuscripts into two classes, finding that their agreements and differences justified such a separation ; and more than this, of these two classes he chose the African family as the safest guide, and by their side he rested with great confidence on the Latin Vulgate. Still, he was obliged to pay homage to the reigning tyranny, and he altered the text only where the various readings had already been printed, contenting himself in other cases with placing the readings he himself thought best, in the margin, with certain marks. In the Apocalypse, however, he allowed himself greater liberty ; but he did not escape severe criticism for his audacity. Wetstein succeeded him ; but he was not able to do as he liked, and could only show his personal preference for readings which differed from those retained in the text. He was, however, of great assistance to future labourers in the same field, although he differed from Bengel in a prejudice against the Vulgate. Griesbach, who began to publish in 1774, followed still further in the same track with Bengel and Wetstein : though he retained the received text as the basis of his own, he ventured to substitute other readings, and to subjoin to the text in other places readings which seemed of equal value with those retained, adding at the same time, in order to enable the reader to form his own judgment, a well-selected array of variations. Griesbach did not share the prejudice of Wetstein against the Vulgate, and thought that the manuscripts of Alexandria, Palestine, and the West, were more authoritative than those of Byzantium. He also brought out the great value of the early versions, and of the quotations given by the Fathers, towards settling the text in doubtful places. After seeing Matthai endeavour to bring about what may almost be called a counter-revolution in favour of the established text, on the authority of the Muscovite MSS., and witnessing also the useful labours of Birch and Kepling, Griesbach commenced, in 1796, another edition of the New Testament, which so far established itself as to have been often reprinted by other critics. We have now arrived at the present century. Scholz, of Bonn, who published his first volume of the New Testament in 1830, made another effort in favour of the Byzantine text. Lachmann, on the other hand, about

the same time, followed the now prevailing opinion of the superiority of the manuscripts of Alexandria, and of the great authority of the early versions and quotations in the Fathers. He abandoned the plan that had hitherto been pursued of *choosing* among various readings, according to certain rules, and set himself simply to endeavour to re-establish the most ancient text as it was, relying chiefly upon the few very old MSS., and upon the citations found in the earliest Fathers, together with the ancient versions, especially the Italic and the Vulgate. His text, we may mention, has been adopted lately in this country by Dr. Stanley and Mr. Jowett, in their editions of some of S. Paul's Epistles. Tischendorf, the last great editor of the text that has appeared, has followed in the same direction mainly. The result of the whole process has been, that we find ourselves now, after nearly three centuries and a half have elapsed since the first printed Greek text, coming back in numberless places to the readings of the Vulgate. In the passages where the "textus receptus" differs from the version of S. Jerome, the decision of modern critics is generally in favour of the latter. This is surely a very striking result, and the more so, because it has been worked out, chiefly, by Protestant critics. We venture to think that it involves a conclusion which has not yet been drawn out to its full legitimate extent. Everything tends to confirm the *critical* authority of the Vulgate. It is known that S. Jerome had access to a great number of manuscripts, which were in all probability of far higher antiquity than any of those which now remain to us—even the most ancient. When we consider the incalculable advantages that he possessed over modern critics in this respect, and couple it with the fact of the homage they are now inclined to pay him, it may reasonably be asked whether it would be unfair or uncritical in the slightest degree to accept his decisions as final; or, at least, as more nearly so than any other to which we can possibly have access. If Mr. Jowett has a right to accept as the best representation of S. Paul's Epistles "the most ancient text as it was, according to the judgment of Lachmann," what is to prevent a Catholic critic from looking, as to the highest possible authority, to the most ancient text as it was—*according to the judgment of S. Jerome?*"

We have said that we consider the first volume of M. Valroger's translation superior to the second. The introductions to the individual books are very valuable as far as they go, but Dr. Reithmayr has hardly allowed himself space to enter fully upon all the questions which, more or less, require discussion. Perhaps on some points he has taken the less probable side. He denies, for instance—contrary, we think, both to the most ancient and the more general opinion—that S. Paul was twice imprisoned at Rome. This is not a matter merely of speculation, for it influences considerably the arrangement and the dates to be assigned to some of his Epistles. We might mention other examples, but none of them are sufficiently important to interfere with the real value of the work. We cannot conclude without observing that the notes added by M. Valroger, at the end of the volumes, are extremely interesting; and we must allow ourselves to express an earnest hope that the dissertations by M. Lehir (of S. Sulpice), on the vexed question of the text, 1 John v. 7, a short analysis of which is given in the second volume, may soon be presented to the public.

Dogmengeschichte der vorchristlichen Zeit. Von Dr. Jos. SCHWANE, Professor der Theologie an der Königl. Akademie zu Münster. Münster: Theissing. 1862.

THE distinction between faith and theology, or, to state the antithesis more pointedly, between dogma and dogmatic theology, must never be lost sight of by those who wish to define the province of Reason, her duties and her just rights. Dogma, as Dr. Schwane uses the term, and as it is commonly received among Catholics, comprises that body of truth which God revealed to His Church, to be by her proposed to the belief of all men. Dogmatic theology is a human science, or, more correctly speaking, a human-divine science, constructed on the data furnished in the dogma or truths revealed by God. It is a human science, inasmuch as it is the creation of human industry and human genius, blessed indeed by God, and developed, we devoutly believe, under a special protection of the Holy Ghost; but still human in its author, human in its weakness, human in its doubts and defects. It is a human-divine science, because all its first principles, the truths which it presupposes, were communicated to man immediately from God. Dogma can never fall under the tyranny of error: it rests on the eternal basis of Divine Truth. Dogmatic theology must always grope its way painfully and laboriously, and it may often go astray,—it has often gone astray. Dogma and faith are one; there is one faith. Theology is not one: it is divided into many schools.

This distinction will become more apparent if we pass to the consideration of the history of dogma, and compare it with that of dogmatic theology. For dogma has its history; and dogmatic theology, like every other human science, has its history also. Who can describe the origin of the Christian dogma? Who can trace its gradual growth during the three years of our Lord's preaching, during the still more important interval which separated the Resurrection from the Ascension, during the seclusion by which the Apostles prepared themselves for the descent of the Holy Ghost? Who can say when and how the complete and perfect scheme of Divine Revelation was impressed on the minds of the Apostles, on the living mind of the *Ecclesia docens*? The precious trust, the trust for all after-ages, was cast into the teeming soil of human thought; it was to be looked at from every side, to be spoken in numberless tongues, to find formulae in every scheme of philosophical language; it was to be misrepresented, contradicted, ridiculed; it was doomed to pass through the rudest trials which the ingenuity of man could contrive against heaven-sent, unwelcome truth; but it was to enjoy a privilege that was never enjoyed by other truths: it was to be guarded by the Holy Ghost; it was to remain ever fresh, ever incorrupt, ever unbroken, in the living mind of the *Ecclesia docens*. The *Ecclesia docens* cannot sacrifice one of the many truths contained in the dogmas of Christ; the *Ecclesia docens* can never betray its trust by the admission of any the least error which would cloud or obscure the revealed dogma. We do not say that the *Ecclesia discens* can err; far from it: we maintain that the promises of God would be frustrated if error could find its way into the *Ecclesia discens*, as much as if it were to

prevail against the *Ecclesia docens*. But, along with this assertion, we hold that Christ's revelation was confided to the *Ecclesia docens*: that revelation was to be her inheritance to the end of time, that she might make it known to every creature. Some portion of the dogma found expression in the earliest days of the Church by the pens of inspired writers, and their writings tell us something of the mind of the Church for that period; we say *something*, for what single volume, even though inspired, would perfectly picture the vast scheme of redemption comprised in the Christian dogma? And, were the picture in itself most faithful and complete, for the age in which it was made, for the countries whose language happened to be employed, how could it convey the same idea to after-generations, to other races with idioms widely differing from those of the inspired penmen? The New Testament tells us something, but not all; whatever is handed down in the Bible, whatever was omitted, all alike lived and continues to live in the Church; and when the controversies of time require her to look into her mind, and to bear witness to the truth committed to her keeping, she will speak distinctly, fearlessly, unerringly: her testimony cannot be false. She may speak either by those who are officially her organs — by her popes, by councils, by the concordant voice of her bishops; or she may speak, not in articulate language, but in the practical utterance of her liturgies, her traditions; in the wishes, the instincts of the faithful. As long as it is doubtful whether she speaks, or how she speaks—and her practical utterance may at times to the minds of some fail to convey a clear and unmistakable idea—faith hangs in suspense; but so soon as it becomes indubitable that she has spoken, faith falls down and worships, for the Church has the words of eternal life. The history of dogma embraces these several utterances of the mind of the Church. As succeeding heresies, as disputes within the fold of the Church, compelled her to speak, the dogma so spoken passed into a new stage of its history: the dogma in itself underwent no change; but a new and unerring utterance of its truth was obtained.

Far otherwise is the history of dogmatic theology. There the origin of the science lies buried in no mysterious source, neither is its progress shrouded from our view: we can trace its beginnings, we can go back to the first ages of its history, and follow it in its course, marking how it is ever adding to the body of materials which it will elaborate. We note the sessions of councils, the decrees of popes, the tomes of patristic wisdom which spread out before our eyes; we observe the attacks of the heretics, directed now against one, now against another portion of the “*depositum fidei*,” until we see that there is work ready for some great genius, who shall gather together what is scattered and isolated, and bind it into one great harmonious whole. The first outlines are drawn by S. John Damascene; and, from his day to ours, the intellect of the *Ecclesia docens*—never wavering in its faith, humbly accepting the dogma believed by the lowliest child of the Church, always true to the Rock of Ages—by the strength of its own inherent powers, and availing itself of the resources of human philosophy, such as it may chance to be, and the aid of profane sciences, will boldly but reverentially grapple with the mysteries revealed: it will seek to explore their meanings; to understand their relations; by analysis, by synthesis, to scan the depths of unfathomable

truth. The story of its labours is not one of unbequered success : many a giant mind has fallen in its efforts after a higher knowledge : many an error has cumbered the path ; long periods of doubt have chilled the struggling theologian ; worst of all, the weapons are ever changing : the philosophy of one age is not the philosophy of another : the advance of physical sciences, the discoveries of philologists, the labours of the antiquary, often cast down what was painfully built up by earlier writers. The history of dogmatic theology is a tale of many failures, of much imperfection ; but it is also a tale of the most glorious triumphs of human intellect.

In the history of dogma, every move is a step in advance ; in the history of dogmatic theology, many strides have been made in a wrong direction. The history of dogma may be compared to that of a beautiful temple, which is complete in all its parts, beautiful in all its proportions, to which succeeding generations have added ornaments, with such happy result that the charm of antiquity is enhanced by the labours of each new architect. The history of dogmatic theology may be compared to that of some forest of the old world ; it dates back many ages ; among its monarchs tower trees whose roots sprang from a virgin soil ; but the earth is cumbered with the ruins of the fallen, the remains of what is past. Every great movement in the human mind reacts on the science of theology : systems disappear, often to be reinstated again in a subsequent revolution ; new ideas, the ideas of each living age of men, force themselves into the domain of theology, to claim admission, perhaps to achieve a conquest and assert their supremacy.

Professor Schwane has wisely narrowed his undertaking to the history of dogma ; and the present volume forms only a portion of that history, and does not extend beyond the first of the four periods into which the Introduction divides the whole matter. Period the first brings us down to the General Council of Nice ; the second, to the Seventh General Council, the Second Council of Nice ; the third, to the Council of Trent ; the fourth extends to our own time. The first corresponds to the age of the Apologies ; the second to the age of Heresies ; the third to the age of the Theologians ; our own period is developing the relations of the Church to the individual and to society.

The body of the work contains four parts : the first traces the history of dogma, so far as it concerns the mystery of the Trinity ; the second, in its connection with the doctrine of the Incarnation ; the third, in all that relates to the original condition of man, his duties in this life, his future in the next ; the fourth part treats of those truths which explain the scheme of Providence by which man receives the benefits of the Redemption ; viz., the Church, her constitution, her duties, the Sacraments, Holy Scripture, &c.

This plan undoubtedly has its advantages. The contrast between dogma in its present phase and dogma in its original phase is capable of being brought out with greater distinctness, and a certain scientific and symmetrical form is thus secured for the work. On the other hand, the true historical character of the inquiry is partially sacrificed. Dogma is not viewed in the actual course of development through which it passed ; and a strong temptation is presented to make out the existence of a belief, for which the documentary evidence is not adduced, if any ever existed. In our judgment, the

simple historical order is the best: the process of time brings with it progressive advances in error; the growth of error determines the growth of dogma. There is something natural, it might be called organically symmetrical, in the growth of error; but side by side with every error the antidote is also seen to flourish and unfold itself: every heresiarch, by the mercy of God, calls forth a champion to do battle for the cause of orthodoxy; and this relation of cause and effect, this parallelism between truth and error, might be made to appear most clearly in a narration closely adhering to the course of time.

Passing from the general division to the treatment of particular questions, Professor Schwane, in the first place, considers the evidence of Scripture, and from Scripture he proceeds to the traditional utterances of the Church. We think he has done well to accept the New Testament as a single body of evidence; he might have emulated the speculations of some of his countrymen, and endeavoured to mark the growth of dogma during the time which witnessed the composition of the several canonical books of the New Law; for, doubtless, that period had its errors, and in those books we possess an inspired record of the dogmatical language of the early Church. But the dissertations of those who have attempted to trace the chronological order of the books of the New Testament, and to award the particular class of errors against which each was specially composed, must have shown Professor Schwane the hopelessness of the undertaking. Besides, he may probably have determined to draw a line where the extraordinary interposition of God ceases: the inspiration of the writers in the New Testament may justly be treated as coalescing with the original revelation; and the growth of dogma may date from the period when the Church is committed to her earthly course, with no other assistance than the never-failing protection of the Holy Ghost against the spirit of error.

Our space will not allow us to examine the execution of the work in its details. No extract can convey an adequate notion of the author's treatment of his subject. It would be necessary to quote an entire section for the purpose. But, unless we are greatly mistaken as to the direction of the theological movement in England, Professor Schwane will soon be favourably known amongst us as having made a most valuable contribution to theological science; valuable for the plan on which his book is constructed, valuable for the minute and exact information which he has brought together into a single volume.

Galileo and the Inquisition. By RICHARD ROBERT MADDEN. London: Burns and Lambert. Dublin: Mullany.

AS we purpose in our next number to discuss fully the important question of the authority of the decrees of the Congregation of the Index and of the Inquisition, we confine ourselves at present to a brief notice of the principal contents of the little volume before us. It is an elaborate, though not always well arranged, digest of the whole evidence that has been brought to bear on the long-agitated case of Galileo and the Roman Inquisition. The first chapter contains a tolerably full account of the career and character of

the Florentine philosopher. The remaining chapters present us with the substance, generally with the very words, of the principal statements and arguments of all the notable writers on both sides of the question, together with a full transcript of the original official documents. With these are intermingled several digressive pages—which would have been much better transferred to notes or appendices—on the Spanish Inquisition, Richard Gibbings, the plunder of the Roman archives, &c. Gibbings is an Irish Protestant clergyman, and an indefatigable scribbler of lying stories against the Catholic Church. The account of the transfer of the archives of the Roman Inquisition from Rome to Trinity College, Dublin, will, we have no doubt, be quite new to the great majority of our readers; as, indeed, until a short time before the appearance of Dr. Madden's book, it had been to ourselves:—

"Some years ago," writes our author, "the Duke of Manchester was informed that certain papers of great value, which had formed part of the archives of the Inquisition, had been abstracted from the palace of that tribunal in Rome, when the French got possession of that capital (in 1849), and eventually they had come into the hands of the then possessor of them. The Duke of Manchester bought them from that person in Paris; and after remaining in his hands for some time, an Irish Protestant clergyman purchased them from the duke for the sum of £500. The documents were brought to Ireland, and by the new possessor were shown to a friend, a distinguished member of the University of Dublin, who at once perceiving the vast importance of them, prevailed on their owner to fix a price on them, being determined, if possible, to secure them for Trinity College library. The price was fixed at £500. The authorities of the university, however, declined to purchase them. The distinguished person referred to then communicated the matter to the late Dr. Wall, likewise a Fellow of the college, a good and worthy man, no less distinguished for his learning than his munificence, and a cheque for the required amount was immediately placed in the hands of his friend. The rifled [?] records, that formed no inconsiderable part of the archives of the Inquisition of Rome, are now deposited in the librarian's room of Trinity College, Dublin, and belong to that great Protestant institution." (P. 62.)

Viewed from common ground, and irrespective of Catholic or Protestant feeling or principle, the character of Galileo as revealed in the documents produced by Dr. Madden is far from estimable or pleasing. To a Catholic it is quite enough to learn that he was on terms of long and close intimacy with the infamous Paul Sarpi (pp. 20, 21). The old story of the exceeding cruelties to which he was subjected by the Roman Inquisition must go the way of so many other "good old Protestant lies." Dr. Madden has proved on the clearest evidence that he was uniformly treated with mildness, kindness, and respect—to our thinking, very unmerited respect.

Dr. Madden should have looked more closely to the correction of the press, especially in the important matter of dates. Thus: "Galileo arrived in Rome the 13th of February, 1663, and he quitted that city finally on the 6th of July, 1633" (p. 96). "Pope Benedict XIV. filled the Papal throne from 1724 to 1732" (p. 114). He did not become Pope for several years after the

latter date. P. 126, it is said that Galileo set out for Rome "in the month of May, 1670." He had been nearly thirty years in his grave at this date.

The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with Remarks on Theories of the Origin of Species by Variation. By Sir CHARLES LYELL, F.R.S. London: Murray.

The Genesis of the Earth and of Man; or, the History of Creation, and the Antiquity and Races of Mankind, considered on Biblical and other grounds. Edited by REGINALD S. POOLE, M.R.S.L. London: Williams & Norgate.

ALTHOUGH the facts disclosed by the progress of geological investigations have often appeared startling to the defenders of Revelation, and although they have often been unfairly used by foolish enemies of the latter, as if they had succeeded in making out a reasonable case against the accuracy of its written monuments, there have never been wanting, either among theologians or geologists, writers of sufficient eminence and weight to turn the current of educated opinion into a more sober and true direction. The science of geology—often rendered ridiculous (as no one has told us better than Sir Charles Lyell in his "Principles") by a succession of the most extravagant and unsubstantial theories, based for the most part upon the smallest amount possible of actual induction—has nevertheless made continual advance, and it cannot fairly be made answerable for the vagaries and absurdities of some of its professors. The constantly succeeding crop of short-lived hypotheses which it has produced, has been, in a certain sense, at once necessary to its progress, and an evidence of it. Solid and substantial growth has resulted from these theories, though they have been themselves exploded and abandoned by their authors. In this sense, geologists need not be ashamed of them. It is, however, fair that the fact of their having existed, and of the intestine strife to which they have given occasion, should be remembered as a warning for the future,—not to deter men of science from framing the best theories they can to explain new phenomena as they arise, but to induce them to preserve that modesty in putting them forward, especially when they appear to clash with portions of truth already firmly established, which, in fact, is generally found in men who are really deep and accurate thinkers, gifted with that calmness and clearness of judgment which is one of the noblest characteristics of the true philosopher.

The first work before us collects and puts forward, with all the force and, we may add, the sobriety which distinguish its author, the evidences as to a fresh disclosure with which the researches of geologists have been rewarded within the last few years. Although it has long been known that the history of the globe on which we live, as it is written in the geological phenomena to which we have access, requires a period of time for its development very far exceeding that which was long assigned to it, according to the received interpretation of Holy Scripture, it has also been generally considered that, as man undoubtedly appeared last of all created beings upon the face of the

earth, geology discloses nothing that contradicts, positively, the lateness of the date assigned for his appearance. For, by lengthening the "days" of the Creation in the Mosaic account into long periods of indefinite duration, or, at all events, by supposing the present arrangement of the earth and its inhabitants to have been preceded by epochs of great length, during which other races of animate beings were its occupants, it was not difficult to harmonize the conclusions of science with the statements of the sacred historian. A new meaning had, indeed, to be put upon the words in which the statements were conveyed; but this had often been the case before, in consequence of similar discoveries. Thus, the received chronology—not, it is true, contained in Scripture, but based upon the combination of Scriptural statements with facts otherwise more or less certain or, at least, unquestioned—remained unassailed so long as geologists did not claim for man himself any extreme antiquity. The last few years have witnessed a change of opinion among men of science. Some, indeed, of the evidence put together in Sir C. Lyell's pages is not recent; but it did not attract attention, or lead the way to any general conclusion, till it derived additional support from the discoveries of the last few years.

It is not necessary, in a notice like the present, to discuss in detail the various items of evidence which have induced Sir C. Lyell to change the opinion he expressed some years ago, in his "*Principles of Geology*," as to the recent origin of man. They are drawn from very different sources, and are connected with the conclusion to which they lead by very various degrees of certainty or probability. It should be remembered, also, that they are here set forth to us by a writer whose own part in the development of geological science has been such as to incline him to assume as the basis of the argument, that all changes in the earth's surface have been produced by causes now still in operation, without very violent convulsions, and that it is fair to estimate the length of time required to produce a given result in some of the ancient periods by that which the same result would now require. The palæontological or geological sources from which the evidence is derived are the following:—First, Sir C. Lyell deals with the works of art found in the peat and shell mounds of Denmark. The peat itself shows that there have been three successive periods of vegetation, characterized by the Scotch fir, the oak, and the beech, respectively; yet, under a trunk of the Scotch fir, at a great depth in the peat, a flint instrument has been found. The Danish antiquaries have established a succession of periods, during all of which man must have existed: these periods are named, from the materials of the weapons and instruments found in each, the ages of Stone, Bronze, and Iron. Skulls have been obtained from the peat, and from tumuli "believed to be contemporaneous with the mounds;" the shell mounds are as old as the oldest peat, and the earliest part of the "age of Stone." The peat cannot have been formed, according to the estimate of competent judges, in less than 4,000 years; and there is nothing to contradict the conclusion that it may not have been 16,000 instead. The second set of witnesses are the ancient Swiss lake-dwellings, built on piles, first discovered in 1853–4. Similar habitations still exist in New Guinea. Underneath these we have stone and bronze implements, fossil plants, remains of animals, wild and

time, among which no extinct species is found. As to the antiquity of the remains, the attempts to arrive at a definite estimate are "confessedly imperfect, but apparently full of promise." They are based on reasonings drawn from the known antiquity of some Roman remains in the delta of the Tinière, and from the quantity of land gained from the lakes of Neufchâtel and Brienne in historic times. They put the "Stone period" at the distance of from 6,000 to 7,000 years. Next come the results of some experiments made in the alluvial bed of the Nile, in which works of art, pottery, &c., are found at a great depth; but it appears that the experiments themselves are "not considered by experienced Egyptologists to have been satisfactory." We have next to cross the Atlantic, and interrogate the famous mounds in the valley of the Ohio, and at Santos in Brazil. The former contain implements and ornaments in silver, copper, and stone, and appear to testify to a civilization which must have been extinct "a great number of centuries." The Santos mounds are about coeval with them. The delta of the Mississippi, near New Orleans, disclosed some years ago a human skeleton, sixteen feet beneath the surface, and underneath four different superincumbent forests. An American geologist, Dr. Dowler, requires 50,000 years for the date of this skeleton, but Sir C. Lyell does not endorse the demand. Another large claim is made for some fossil human remains said to have been found on a part of the coral reef of which a portion of Florida is composed, which, according to the calculations of Agassiz as to the ordinary rate of increase of the reef in question, should be placed at a distance of 10,000 years. Returning to Europe, we are next taken to Scotland, and we find ourselves once more asked to allow a comparatively moderate interval of time between ourselves and the early race whose handiwork survives in the shape of canoes found in what was once the bed of the Clyde, and "a rude ornament of cannell coal found on the coast, in the parish of Dundonald, fifty feet above the sea level." For the latter, a lapse of fifteen centuries only is required. All the remains hitherto enumerated are formations which belong to what geologists call the "recent" period, in which both the fossil shells and mammalia are of living species. But the evidences of the existence of man extend backward far beyond this: how far, no one ventures exactly to say. We have to traverse a considerable interval of time before we arrive at the Post-Pleiocene period, when some of the prevalent mammalia were of extinct species; but in this period man must have existed, according to the remains found in the Liège caverns, and the flint implements at Abbeville and S. Acheul, and in the Brixham cave. We forbear attempting any enumeration of the other spots at which remains of the same kind have been found, as our object is simply to state conclusions, at least probable, as to the extent of time required by the late discoveries. "We cannot ascertain," says Sir C. Lyell, "the limits, whether of the beginning or of the end of the first Stone period, when man co-existed with the extinct mammalia; but that it was of great duration we cannot doubt." Great as it was, however, he seems to anticipate that we may have ultimately to go beyond it for the first "introduction" of man. Before this period there was a time when a great part of the northern hemisphere, including our own country, was submerged in an icy sea; and yet again, before this, what is called by geologists the "First Continental

period." We have remains of this in the forest underlying the cliffs of Cromer, and other parts of the Norfolk coast. Yet even in this Sir C. Lyell seems to think that the traces of man's co-existence *may* be discovered; and, should these hereafter "be revealed to us, they would carry back the antiquity of man to a distance of time probably more than twice as great as that which separates our era from that of the most ancient of the tool-bearing gravels yet discovered in Picardy or elsewhere." (P. 228.)

Besides the evidence in favour of the antiquity of man, the work before us contains "Some Remarks on the Origin of Species by Natural Selection." Sir C. Lyell's adhesion to the Darwinian theory is the more remarkable, because he was before supposed to be adverse to it. His description of the Neanderthal skull, and of the controversy between Professors Huxley and Owen, shows that he favours the simian origin of man; if, indeed, his book be not mainly intended to supply a link required for the proof of that doctrine. But we hope shortly to discuss the whole of this question more completely. We shall here only deal with the geological part of the book, as far as it bears on the relation between the modern discoveries and the truths which are contained in the Sacred Scriptures, or in the doctrines of our Christian faith.

We shall not raise the question at present as to the fact of an apparently existing conflict between the two. We may think that the conclusions on either side are not yet sufficiently determinate and precise. The great vice of inductive reasoners, and of the writers on physical science—a fault into which, on Sir C. Lyell's own showing, most geologists have fallen—is a too rapid generalisation from particular instances; a too hasty assertion of a conclusion as certain, the proof of which is made up of many links, some of which can only be affirmed conjecturally or probably. It would be well if many of these authors would go through a good course of logic before they begin to write. Their inductions are often built upon a very small number of instances. Sir C. Lyell, who has himself drawn attention to this fact, seems to us to be not quite free from the fault of his brethren. For instance, he seems inclined to conclude that the ancient race of men whose track he has been following up, were universally savage and degraded, while the proofs of such a condition are drawn from examples in which they had the same difficulties of climate to contend with as the present Esquimaux. It has been shown, since his book was published, that there are races at present in existence leading much the same kind of lives and using the same implements as those who are said to have left these remains in the drift at Abbeville and elsewhere. Would it be logical for a philosopher a hundred centuries hence to judge of the present civilization of the world by the remains of these tribes? With regard to the chain of reasoning by which the antiquity of man is now considered to be demonstrated, it may, at all events, be said, that it must stand the test of time and further discussion, before it can be admitted as establishing a certain scientific truth. On the other hand, there is every reason for examining how far the received systems of chronology are to be considered as having the full weight of Scriptural authority; or, in other words, whether a complete system can be drawn out from Biblical statements exclusively. The question is changed considerably

if it be found that materials drawn from other sources and resting on other authority, have to be dovetailed in, in order to supply the gaps that are still left, after the scattered assertions of the sacred writers have been put together. Nor ought it to be forgotten, that the learned men to whose labours the received systems are due, lived at a time when it was as much a matter of course to suppose that the earth and man had existed for a few thousand years only, as it once was to believe that the sun went round the earth.

Let us, however, suppose that the time has arrived when the certain conclusions of geological science seem to contradict the express assertions of the text of Scripture. In the work edited by Mr. Poole we have one instance out of many that might be adduced, of the way in which the case may be met by the advocates of the strict accuracy of Biblical statements among Protestant men of learning. We may have to make some remarks adverse to the author before we part from him ; but we cannot help thinking that his spirit contrasts very favourably with that of other writers, who throw overboard the statements of Scripture at the first apparent difficulty, as if they were only too glad to get rid of them. "It is true," writes Canon Stanley, in the Preface to his Lectures on the Jewish Church, "that the rigid acceptance of every part of the Old Testament as of equal authority, equal value, and equal accuracy, is rendered impossible by every advance made in Biblical science, and by every increase of our acquaintance with Eastern customs and primeval history. But it is no less true, that by almost every one of these advances, *the beauty and grandeur* of the substance and spirit of its different parts are enhanced to a degree far transcending all that was possible in former ages." Fine words, indeed !—but without much meaning, and with still less truth. The writer before us, at all events, does not console himself with "the beauty and the grandeur" of a narrative which turns out to be inaccurate, but sets himself honestly to work to find out what Scripture really does say about the antiquity of man. The two fundamental suppositions from which he starts are these :—His investigation supposes that what Scripture says is true, and yet that the prevailing opinion as to what Scripture means may be false. If we limit this last supposition properly, there is nothing in it at all startling to ordinary Catholics. The prevailing opinion in the Catholic Church as to what Scripture says on matters which belong to the deposit of the Faith, or to the rule of action, cannot be false ; for it embodies the teaching of the authorized exponent of Scripture. But it has never been denied that the common opinion as to what is asserted in Scripture on other points, such as belong, for instance, to the physical history of the universe, may be mistaken, and may be corrected and improved from time to time by the progress of science and the discoveries of history. Thus, Bellarmine was of opinion at the time that Galileo's doctrines were first attracting notice, that "when a demonstration shall be found to establish the earth's motion" (and we may remark, in passing, that such a demonstration had not been found by Galileo), "then it will be proper to interpret the Sacred Scriptures otherwise than they have hitherto been in those passages where mention is made of the stability of the earth, and movement of the heavens."

We suppose that scientific men of our own day will not object to being put on a par with Galileo. The writer before us would say that the parallel is complete : it may be more complete than he supposes ; for we suspect that, just as Galileo's *proofs* are now acknowledged to have been insufficient, time will reveal similar flaws in the evidence for man's antiquity. But he is right in principle in supposing that, the hypothesis once granted, the next step to be taken is to seek an interpretation of the various statements contained in Scripture on the subject, which may be in harmony with the truths otherwise ascertained. This is what has been done in the case mentioned, and, in our own day, with regard to the account given of the Creation in the opening chapter of Genesis.

The volume before us exemplifies one great difference between Catholics and Protestants, as to the inquiries in which they will respectively permit themselves to indulge, in seeking for the solution of difficulties such as that now raised. The Catholic is not less tenderly careful for the doctrine of the Church than for the authority of Sacred Scripture. The Protestant, unfortunately, has but an accidental and partial grasp of dogmatic truth ; and as he does not always know when it is attacked, he will not always be careful to defend it or to respect it. Thus Dr. Colenso may write what he has written upon the ignorance of our Lord on certain subjects (Part I., Pref. p. xxxi.), and the whole Anglican Episcopacy will never take him to task for *that*. The writer before us handles the subjects with which he deals with earnestness and reverence, and we do not charge it to him as a fault that he is sometimes not quite aware on what dangerous ground he is treading. The line of the whole book is pointed out in the following few words, which we extract from Mr. Poole's preface :—

"The common opinion, that man was first created six or seven thousand years ago, is considered by all who have in any degree mastered the subject, to be no longer tenable. Two new theories have been offered in its place. One clings to the one origin of our race, but assigns to it an enormous antiquity. The other suggests the existence of a Pre-Adamite race, and supposes the Biblical narrative to refer especially to a higher and later stock. No third theory seems possible."—(P. xvii.)

It is the latter of these two theories that the author adopts ; and we thus have the old Pre-Adamite controversy revived. The whole of the book, except the first chapter, which deals with the account of the creation of the earth, is devoted to a conscientious investigation of the various sources from which light may be derived for the solution of this question. First comes Scripture ; then follow, in succession, physical, chronological, and historical observations ; and the volume concludes with an elaborate and interesting chapter, in which the bearings of the current philological theories on the question are discussed. The author's system differs little in its essential features from that advocated by Isaac la Peyre in the seventeenth century, and he frequently uses the same arguments when the two theories seem parallel to one another. He therefore exposes himself to many of the forcible objections brought forward by Zaccaria in his dissertation against the system of the French Calvinist. He does not deny the existence of original sin, though, perhaps, it is not very easy to understand what he means by it ; and he will hardly, we think,

satisfy even Protestants by his words with regard to its universality. "Supposing the existence of Non-Adamites, these are excluded; and the reasons for their exclusion are sufficiently obvious" (p. 54). "These passages (Rom. v. 12, 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22) assert that one man brought death upon his posterity; and this fact is by no means inconsistent with the existence of multitudes of other men, of whom every one died for his own transgression against the law written in his heart" (p. 55). As we are not discussing the merits of the question with the author, we forbear to do more than allude to the obvious difficulties that would be raised against this statement by any one well acquainted with the argument of the Apostle in the former of the two passages of which he speaks. He provides in a curious way for the connection of all men—Non-Adamite as well as others—with our Blessed Redeemer:—

"To effect the universal blood-relationship to the Saviour, it would suffice that any one of Adam's descendants in the line of our Lord's genealogy was allied by marriage to a family of the neighbouring Mongolian variety, and that this Mongolian family was allied to one of mixed blood, partly Malayan and partly Negro; and as the Mongolian variety extends to a region in which Malayans and Negroes are found to be intermixed, the supposition of such alliance is not unreasonable."—(P. 64.)

We have not quoted these passages for the purpose of casting ridicule upon the author, and we cannot close our notice of him without reiterating our witness both to his honesty and his industry. But it is not lost labour to have pointed out a truth which he has not, indeed, entirely forgotten, but the importance and extensive bearings of which he could hardly be expected to realize:—that all our inquiries into subjects of this nature must be carried on with continual and submissive reference to the great doctrines of the Faith. With regard to these, we start from certainty—absolute, final certainty. They do not admit of change or modification, as may be the case with the meaning of a difficult passage; nor can the discoveries of physical science throw any new light upon them. Mr. Poole, in his preface, has protested strongly against the tendency of men of science to dogmatize beyond their sphere:—

"In the worst days of priestly bigotry, nothing was done by the opponents of science surpassing the audacity of scientific men, who, knowing little Greek, no Hebrew, and in complete ignorance of Semitism, set themselves down to decide authoritatively the great question of the Biblical cosmogony."—(P. vi.)

There are some things more important even than Hebrew scholarship and the knowledge of Semitism, for questions such as that now raised: a firm faith in, and an accurate theological knowledge of, the great truths of Revelation relating to our race and its history, which alone can explain the riddle of our existence, make our individual and social happiness possible, and afford a sure foundation to our hopes of a blessed futurity.

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part I.—Abraham to Samuel.
By ARTHUR P. STANLEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical
History, and Canon of Christ Church. London: Murray.

DR. STANLEY is, on certain subjects, a remarkably interesting and fascinating writer, and it is perhaps no great injustice to him to suppose that the Lectures before us have been composed rather with a view to the wide circle of readers which the popularity of his name is certain to secure for them, than to the closer and sterner requirements of an Academical Lecture-room. There can be no objection to the making lectures, addressed "chiefly to candidates for Holy Orders," interesting, graphic, and popular; still, something more is required for a learned audience than for a drawing-room, and a Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History hardly discharges his duty of storing the minds of his hearers with solid information, by setting before them a series of scenic sketches, which please for the moment by their freshness of colour and the skill with which they are illustrated from physical and geographical sources, while deep and far-reaching questions which lie below the surface are left entirely untouched. We are not disposed to question that a great amount of light may often be thrown upon the history of a nation by a picturesque and accurate description of the physical features and peculiarities of the land in which its lot is cast. Such a sketch Dr. Stanley has already given, with almost unexampled success, in his "Sinai and Palestine." Neither can it be doubted that everything in the East is marvelously unchangeable, and that, consequently, the manners and modes of thought of the present inhabitants of Palestine and the neighbouring countries serve to illustrate very vividly those of their predecessors in earlier ages.

There is, however, something more to be known about the Jews than can be conveyed by a perpetual assertion of "their Bedouin character" or any amount of illustration of this kind, in which Dr. Stanley is certainly a master. He lacks other more important qualifications as an historian, and he hardly makes up for the deficiency by his general reference to Dr. Milman and Ewald. There is a whole class of important matters which in his pages are only "conspicuous by their absence." He professes especially to lecture on the history of the Jewish Church as such, yet the whole of the elaborate and wonderful system of institutions,—hierarchy, worship, and ritual,—which that word suggests, finds but a very small place in his work. If we wish to descend into the interior religious life, moral conceptions, and dogmatic faith of the Jews, we shall get little help from Dr. Stanley. This is perhaps not so much an instance of his want of ability to grapple with matters of substantial importance, as the consequence of prejudices which make him resolutely averse to the handling of such topics. These prejudices are shown in every word that he says about the Jewish priesthood, and his reiterated denial that it has left any successor behind it in the Christian system. This studied depreciation of everything hierarchical and positive in religious institutions and religious belief makes him quite unfit to lecture on the

history of the Jewish Church. Other defects, however, come from want of power. Dr. Stanley has quite an amusing art of eluding a serious question while he appears to be saying something fine about it. We can afford to take only a single instance : it shall be the manner in which he deals with the moral difficulty raised by the Divine precept which bade the Israelites utterly to exterminate the inhabitants of the country they invaded. Dr. Stanley first quotes a passage of S. Chrysostom on one of the Psalms, and then two verses from the Sermon on the Mount, and the passage in S. Luke where the Apostles are rebuked for thinking of imitating Elijah in calling down fire on their enemies. The purport of these quotations is to show that the law of Christian charity goes beyond what was required under the old dispensation. Whether this doctrine be or be not well-founded, we need not here discuss ; for the difficulty surely consists in this, that the conduct enjoined on the Israelites by an All-Holy God is apparently an offence, not only against Christian charity as such, but against justice and moral right. Dr. Stanley seems to feel that something more is required, and so, as his fashion is, he has recourse to modern history. "We have no right," he says, "to find objections to these portions of the Old Testament, when we acknowledge the same feelings in ourselves or others without reprobation." Then he quotes two instances. One is, that "conscientious and religious men" in India, at the time of the Sepoy rebellion, thought that "the only rule for us to follow," with regard to the rebels, was that laid down in the Book of Joshua. The other is, that Mr. Carlyle, who "in a great measure represents the most advanced intelligence of our age," has a disgraceful passage in which he justifies Cromwell's barbarities at Drogheda. This kind of thing may go down with seaside loungers, but if it satisfies the intelligence of the University students, for whom these lectures were composed, as to the *command* given by God with regard to the Canaanites, we shall be inclined to *think* that the complaints lately made as to the lowering of the mental standard among candidates for Anglican orders are not without foundation.

The same shallowness is often shown by Dr. Stanley in the inferences that he draws from facts that he has to relate. These inferences are as often as possible in one direction : for just as Gibbon is always on the look-out for an occasion to sneer at Christianity, so is Dr. Stanley ever ready for a sly cut at dogmatism or priestcraft. He works himself up to them with a solemnity under which his usually pleasant and graphic style labours into pomposity. Let us give a single instance of this defect also—an instance of the most transparent and childish sophistry. He is speaking of the conduct of Abraham, when there was a dispute between his own herdsmen and those of Lot. Dr. Stanley becomes impressive :—"The first *controversy*, the first primeval pastoral controversy, divided the Patriarchal Church. Abraham begs there may be no strife : 'If thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right ; or if thou depart to the right hand, I will go to the left.'" This, he tells us, is "language which might well extend to the strife of pastors and teachers in many a church and nation ;" it is "the first instance of 'agreeing to differ,' in later times so rarely found, so eagerly condemned." Very deep indeed ! Dr. Stanley, then, sees no difference between questions as to wells and springs, and questions as to Divine Truth : or, may we ask,

how with regard to these, can there be a right-hand or a left-hand path, as to which we are to be indifferent? Dr. Stanley is perfectly well aware that the "pastors and teachers" at whom he sneers, when they will not agree to differ, do so precisely because they consider that interests are at stake which cannot be sacrificed, and for which Abraham would have fought as obstinately as themselves.

We notice the same *animus* continually "cropping up" in his historical illustrations. His mania is, to be always grouping together similar facts and persons that belong to distant and different periods: an admirable thing when done naturally, but which he carries to a pedantic excess. It is obvious, however, that this kind of illustration may often be used in a very unfair way by a writer whose mind is so full of prejudice, and who is so fond of covertly indulging it as is Dr. Stanley. It is very easy to point a sarcasm at mediæval Christianity by an anecdote parallel, in a distant way, to some rude and lawless act related in the Book of Judges. But the inference drawn by the reader is unsound and untrue. Dr. Stanley is a great adept in this underhand and unfair style of controversy, notwithstanding all his professions of fairness and largeness. If he "agrees to differ," and lets Lot go to the right hand or to the left, he cannot restrain himself from throwing stones at his kinsman when he least expects an assault. In reading his pages, we never know when we are safe from these side attacks. Everything is charming and picturesque: we seem to have the atmosphere and scenery of Palestine all around us,—its mountains and plains, glades and torrents, cornfields and vineyards, with musical passages from the "Christian Year" and other poems ringing in our ears. Suddenly, we are stabbed in the back—not by one of the Bedouins, of whom the author is so fond, but by Dr. Stanley himself, with some sarcastic *skit* at the theologians who condemned Galileo, or the monks who wanted to get hold of the relics of S. Thomas:—

medio de fonte leporum,
Surgit amari aliquid—

and we experience a sensation that reminds us of nursery days, when perchance we found a black-beetle in the middle of a bun. We will venture, moreover, to question the accuracy of Dr. Stanley's historical allusions. He is very fond of using, in the way of which we have been speaking, the popular and exploded version of an incident or a character, in preference to the correct one. His remarks about Galileo are a case in point. A much less excusable one, if we remember right, occurs in his Commentary on the Corinthians. In that commentary he does his best to turn S. Paul against himself, and to prove that, without regard to particular cases, the Apostle teaches that the married state is better than that of virginity, though for his own personal character he thought the latter most suited. And, in the course of this strange argument, Dr. Stanley, indulging his inveterate love for historical parallelism, actually places by the side of S. Paul as to this idiosyncratic love for purity—*Queen Elizabeth!*

There are far deeper errors in the book than any which we have now pointed out; but we could not even explain our meaning as to their character without extending our remarks to a length inconsistent with the idea of a

short notice. They are errors so widely extended in England at the present time, that we shall have again and again to advert to them in our future numbers.

Albert le Grand, sa Vie et sa Science, d'après les documents originaux. Par M. le Docteur JOACHIM SIGHART, Professeur de Philosophie au Lycée Royal de Freising ; traduit de l'Allemand par un Religieux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs. Paris : Poussielgue-Rusand.

THE Blessed Albert, or Albertus Magnus, as he is generally called in England, used to say that Germans possessed little natural aptitude for study ; but that when they applied themselves to it, their perseverance enabled them to carry the day over all competitors. He was himself a striking exemplification of, at least, the latter part of this remark. Whether he was possessed of great natural ability and quickness is at least called in question by the well-known story which represents his success as mainly due to the miraculous intervention of our Blessed Lady. However this may be, it is certain that the thirteenth century, which produced out of the bosom of the two orders of mendicant friars so many illustrious men, gave to the world no intellect more active or more fully developed than his. Yet, in spite of its greatness, the name of Albert stands at the present day for no more than that of an antiquated philosopher and theologian, the preceptor of S. Thomas Aquinas, and author of some one-and-twenty thick volumes in folio which nobody cares to read. A few pretty but untruthful legends concerning him have always retained their popularity. Encyclopædias and dictionaries of biography furnish a meagre outline of his career, seldom without a sneer at that stupid and forgotten something which he taught under the name of philosophy, but which has been long since exploded by Descartes and his successors. Beyond this, and the casual honours paid to him by those whose mediæval researches have forced them to acknowledge his merits, there is little knowledge and still less appreciation of the genius of the Blessed Albert, not only in the world at large, but even amongst theologians, philosophers, and historians. Yet the prodigious extent and depth of his learning, and the amount of influence he exercised on his times, were such as to deserve a better fate. He towered, like another Saul, head and shoulders above all contemporary warriors of Israel, his lofty figure being conspicuous amongst the men of his day in almost every department of science.

Dr. Sighart, therefore, has rendered great service to history by his very accurate and elaborate account of the man and his writings. Fully alive to the difficulties of his undertaking, he has, with the traditional industry and patience of his nation, made himself master of most of Albert's writings, visited every spot hallowed by his name, painfully fixed the loose chronology of his life, and produced, in fact, a far more exact portrait of him than we had any right beforehand to expect. The holy doctor now stands before us clad in all the glorious attributes which the sweet painter of Fiesole knew so well how to symbolize in fresco or in miniature. We can realize him in his

various aspects, as a religious, a professor, a preacher to the poor, a reforming bishop, and a scientific writer; whilst, by the help of Dr. Sighart's careful analyses and judicious extracts, we are enabled to form some idea of the value of the contents of those ponderous tomes which grew under his pen, to the illustration and advancement of theology, metaphysics, psychology, physical geography, botany, zoology, physiology, and other sciences. His life reads like the description of some grand cathedral of the middle age. When, after wandering about amidst endless and exquisite detail, wondering at the variety and originality of separate designs, we at last endeavour to take in at one comprehensive glance the general intention and proportions of the vast edifice, we are struck with the marvellous unity of the whole. Its multiplied lines and entangled tracery are but the harmonious play of a fancy that never loses sight of its main purpose, the ebullitions of a thought intensely one. They impart warmth and interest, but do not distract, because one unitive, vivifying idea runs through them all. And such is the life of Albertus Magnus,—a work of art wrought out by the concurrence of Divine grace and human liberty; its one idea being the glory of God and the good of souls sought in the development and exercise of every mental faculty. The singleness of purpose necessary to make the saint animated all his actions and pursuits.

For years the Bible was his only book, because obedience devoted him to Scriptural study. He possessed the whole Psalter by heart, and gained that perfect familiarity with the Sacred Text, and its literal, allegorical, and tropological meanings, which enabled him afterwards to produce, with astonishing facility, commentaries the most elaborate, and sermons which are, for the most part, a skilful embroidery of Scripture phrase and imagery. At another time, his table was strewn with plans, because a new convent had to be built for his brethren, or a cathedral was wanted which should be worthy of the mysteries to be celebrated within its walls. Dr. Sighart will not allow that he had any part in the construction of the great Dom Kirch of Cologne, and leaves it doubtful whether he contributed more than money and encouragement to the rebuilding of the choir of the Dominican church in the same city; but it is certain that he was no mean proficient in architectural design, and that the traditions of his order give him the credit of designing many beautiful convents and churches in the diocese of Cologne and in the Low Countries. Another way in which he aided the solemnity of the divine office was by the construction of organs. The entertainment and instruction of his younger brethren was his sole motive for inventing a variety of clever automata and other mechanical instruments. The same desire accompanied him in times of recreation, when he would wander by the banks of the Rhine, or other rivers, conversing familiarly with every poor fisherman he met, gathering fresh facts in natural history from their experience, or observing for himself every variety of natural phenomena. Meanwhile, he was assiduously employed upon tasks of a severer nature, which were by themselves more than enough to exhaust the energies of most men. He popularized the four books of Peter Lombard's "*Sentences*" upon a plan calculated at once to increase the knowledge and stimulate the devotion of the middle classes. He was an effective and frequent preacher, adapting him-

self with the utmost facility to any audience, though he much preferred the work of evangelizing the poor, whom he never failed to attract by his earnestness and simplicity. At the same time, the professorial chair was more particularly the seat of his activity. He taught at Hildesheim, Freiburg, Ratisbon, Strasburg, Paris, and, above all, at Cologne. At one time his teaching embraced the whole circle of the natural sciences; at another, he explained the treatises of Aristotle on logic, metaphysics, and psychology. That he might the better rescue that philosopher from the corruptions of the Arabian commentators, he diligently collated the Latin translations from the Arabic with others made directly from the Greek, a work in which he displayed a sagacity perfectly astonishing in one who was utterly deficient in critical knowledge. By a multitude of separate treatises, eighty or more in number, he illustrated the text of Aristotle, corrected many of his errors, christianized him on many points, and laid the foundation for the more comprehensive commentaries of his beloved disciple S. Thomas. Sometimes, however, charity called him away to a more active life, and we find him acting as arbiter between the citizens of Cologne and their archbishop, or between one contending city and another, and settling, to the satisfaction of all parties, disputes upon points of law, which threatened, but for his intervention, never to have an end. At length, Rome determined to avail itself of the services of so holy and vigorous a man in a more extended sphere of action, and Pope Alexander IV. called him to the bishopric of Ratisbon. The duties of that office were little to his taste; but for two years he overcame all repugnances, and, for the sake of souls and in the spirit of obedience, devoted all his energies to the reform of his diocese, and managed with consummate prudence the multiplied affairs, religious and secular, in which at that time German bishops were compelled to engage. As soon as he had reduced things to order, he hastened to lay down his unwelcome dignity, and obtaining his release from Urban IV., devoted his remaining years to the unobtrusive labours of a writer and teacher. For a short time, indeed, in obedience to papal authority, he traversed on foot Bavaria, Suabia, Franconia, and a large part of Germany, preaching the Crusade with all the ardour of a S. Bernard. But with this exception, and that of his presence at the General Council of Lyons in the capacity of ambassador from King Rodolph of Hapsburg, he lived in retirement at his beloved convent of Cologne, surrounded by the youth of his Order, to whom he was at once a pattern of religious virtue and an instructor in science of equal ability, experience, and zeal. At last, when he recognized in the loss of his memory the call of God to abandon the chair which he had adorned for more than half a century, with a detachment the most absolute from all external things, he consecrated the three closing years of his life to solitude, contemplation, and immediate preparation for death. Such was the long career of the Blessed Albert, a prodigy of untiring energy, and a monument of devotedness to the glory of God and the good of souls.

It is not surprising that in the course of time legends should have multiplied around the name of such a man. Dr. Sighart very judiciously gives the most interesting of these entire, before submitting them to the test of criticism. He has shown great ingenuity in detecting their sources, and

stripping them of the exaggerations and distorting additions which most of them owe to popular rumour. The most curious, as illustrative of the temper of the period, are those which attribute to him magical power. They are invariably traceable to his experiments in physical science, or to the automata which his ingenuity invented. But the name of Albert suffers no diminution of glory by being divested of the dim halo of legendary renown. His true greatness lay in his indisputable sanctity, and in the ability with which he not only grasped the whole compass of knowledge as it existed in his time, but reached out far into the future by his anticipations of physical truth, and enriched whatever subject he treated with suggestive ideas, and the results of his personal observations. Ritter, Brandis, and Zeller, have given in their works a very fair sketch of his metaphysical doctrines, but their more extended accounts receive additional completeness from the extracts made by Dr. Sighart, who has confined himself to the exhibition of those particulars in which Albert ventured beyond his predecessors, or struck out a new line for himself. Their number and importance are a convincing proof that Albert in no way deserved the nickname bestowed on him by Bayle, and repeated so often by men equally unacquainted with his works, of "le singe d'Aristote."

In theology he was speedily eclipsed by his disciple S. Thomas, and by Duns Scotus, both of whom, however, owed more than it is easy to determine to the labours of their predecessor. Indeed, several of the works of S. Thomas would, in these days, be called wholesale plagiarisms from his master's writings. The substance of his three works in defence of religious life is to be found in the answers given by Albert to the attacks of William of Saint-Amour. And many of his arguments against the psychology of Averroes are taken almost word for word from Albert's Treatise on the Soul. But the great men of the Middle Ages were not subject to the petty jealousies of modern authors. They were not discomposed by the rustling of another's bays. The products of one man's intellect were the common property of all. Were they not all fighting in the same sacred cause? And why, then, should they begrudge one another the use of any weapon that seemed serviceable, whoever might have been its first inventor? They published in order that all their fellow-workers might turn their labours to account, and were generously careless of the recognition of their individual services. Thus Albert took an unselfish pleasure in the glory of S. Thomas, journeyed to Paris in order to take up his defence against the violent attacks made upon him shortly after his death, and forgot the value and merits of his own writings altogether in his eulogiums of the angelical doctor, as the discoverer of every truth and the solver of all problems. Modern research has assigned to Albert the invention of a theological formula, which has since played an important part in the theology of the Sacraments, and which has been adopted by the Church as the exact expression of a great dogmatic truth. The term *opus operans* or *opus operantis* occurs first in his writings; and there is every reason to believe that he invented the corresponding formula, *opus operatum*, which came into general use not long after his death. He added two new proofs of the existence of God to the arguments usually employed, exposed the fallacies of Pantheism, completed the doctrine of Peter Lombard on

reprobation, refuted with consummate ability the Aristotelian doctrine of the eternity of the world, introduced the famous distinction ever since employed against optimism, illustrated by ingenious analogies the Catholic doctrine of justification, and went more profoundly than any of his predecessors into the sublime mystery of the Ever-Blessed Trinity. His treatise also on the Eucharist contains, more or less developed, all that S. Thomas subsequently worked up into the masterly treatise on that Sacrament in his "*Summa Theologica*."

To the proficiency of Albert in physical science, justice has of late been done by more than one amongst the greatest physicists of modern times. Dr. Sighart has brought together their various testimonies. Perhaps none is more interesting than that of Alexander von Humboldt, who calls his "*Liber Geographicus de Natura Locorum*" an abridgment of physical geography almost prophetic in its sagacious anticipations, especially with respect to the habitableness of various parts of the globe, and the combined influence of difference of latitude and the structure of the earth's surface, as modifying the radiation of heat, upon climate and atmospheric phenomena. Meyer, in his "*Linnaea*," does similar honour to Albert's botanical treatises, proclaiming his superiority to all predecessors, with the exception of Theophrastus, whose works he had not seen, and to all successors, at least during the three following centuries.

The weak points in Albert's attainments were language and history. He knew no Greek, Arabic, or Hebrew, and, like most writers of his age, fell into the most ludicrous absurdities whenever he attempted to trace the etymology of words. Dr. Sighart exhibits not a few of his mistakes, both in etymology and in history. They are characteristic, however, rather of the times than of the man. And surely it is only justice to deal leniently with errors of this sort, which, after all, were of comparatively little importance in the matters of which he treated. There is far less to condemn in his blunders than to admire in the penetration which seized so faithfully upon the meaning of Plato, Aristotle, and the Arabian philosophers, although he had access to their works only in execrable Latin translations.

This conscientious and learned life of him by Dr. Sighart has already been well received in Germany. The excellent series now publishing at Paris, under the name of "*Bibliothèque Dominicaine*," has been enriched by the careful translation which forms the subject of this notice. It only remains that the English language should possess either a translation of the same work, or, what we should hail with still greater pleasure, an original work upon the same subject, based on the critical researches of Dr. Sighart, but relieved from the somewhat heavy style of writing which diminishes the charm of a very interesting book.

Livre de Prières. Illustré à l'aide des Ornaments des Manuscrits, classés dans l'ordre chronologique et selon les styles divers qui se sont succédés depuis le huitième siècle jusqu'au seizième, reproduits en couleurs, et publiés par B. C. MATHIEU. Paris : 15, Rue Dufour. 2 vols.

PATIENCE was the watchword of the Middle Ages, as despatch is that of modern times. *Slow, but sure* was all very well hundreds of years ago, but will hardly suit our generation. So the age thinks, and acts in accordance with the thought. Where are the toiling hands that laboured for a lifetime in illuminating the books that now form the treasures of our most valued libraries? Where the aching eyes that watched over their production and long-deferred completion? Where, above all, are the minds trained to the most exquisite symmetry and accuracy, whose original designs we, for lack of power to improve upon, are fain to imitate? The art of printing, aided by the spirit of utilitarianism, has swept them away; and we have been content to gaze in admiration on the wreck of the past, without an effort at competition, and almost without a thought of preserving the secrets of an art which was perfected only after centuries of painful labour, cheerfully endured, because tending to the spread of religious truth. "*Tot enim vulnera Satanas accipit, quot antiquarius Domini verba describit.*"* Its scattered remnants, we are glad to say, are now in great request, and are daily becoming more highly prized. It is not because they are suited to the taste of the age: rather the converse—the age has suited its taste to them. Have we not for the last forty years been becoming more and more mediæval every day? Gladly, then, do we see multiplied around us and placed within the reach of all men of taste, works illustrative of the genius of the past, and, not least of all, specimens of the art of illumination, which but for the monks of old would have been smothered in its infancy. We are their debtors for everything in this class that we possess: we must blame their persecutors for the loss of that which can never be replaced. Surrounded with our modern appliances, we have little idea of the difficulties encountered in ancient times even in the mere task of writing. Take, for instance, paper. What a number of different materials have been employed in its stead! Durability has been sought in rocks, stones, bricks, tablets of lead, wood, or wax, leaves and bark of trees, the skin of fish, tortoise-shells, and even the entrails of beasts. Some of these were perhaps selected rather through curiosity than necessity; for one hardly can attribute to anything but capricious humour the writing out the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in letters of gold upon a serpent's intestines. Such a curiosity is said to have formed part of the famous library of Constantinople which was destroyed by fire towards the end of the sixth century. Then we have had papyrus, parchment or vellum, and, lastly, paper, which the twelfth century seems to have invented. Before we can duly appreciate the calligraphic art of the ancients, we must both enter into their sphere of thought, and measure with precision the ground on which they stood.

* Cassiodorus, "De Orthographia."

Such are the first thoughts suggested on opening the work before us. To give a world-wide fame, as far as imitation can accomplish it, to the finest illuminated manuscripts that are to be met with in Europe, to place fac-simile specimens of this sort of book decoration before the eyes of the public, and to do all this with order, system, and according to fixed principles, has been the aim of the editor. We cannot all leisurely examine the magnificent works of this class which are securely guarded in the Louvre or British Museum; but, as far as the limited scope of the artist allowed him, the difficulties under which we should otherwise labour in tracing the course of this art have been smoothed down, and we may at our case contemplate imitations most carefully and artistically executed, preserving to a nicety the slightest variation in delineation and hue, of the choicest specimens extant of this branch of the fine arts.

M. Mathieu's work, as will be readily acknowledged after an insight into its contents, supplies a deficiency in the artistic world. It consists of two volumes, the first containing 150 pages, ornamented with imitations of the most pleasing designs of the decorative art that are anywhere to be found, of which fourteen are miniatures or frontispieces, the rest being borders in gold and colours, worked according to the most recent improvements in the chromo-lithographic process. Of course, not even the veriest tyro would think of comparing them with the originals. No modern gilding process will equal the raised and burnished gold of the old manuscripts; no modern colouring will successfully rival the brilliant red which, after the lapse of 800 years, is as vivid as when first laid on. But how few are in possession of such books! Some of them are almost a fortune in themselves. We must, therefore, be content to have as close an approximation as modern art and science combined can produce; and for discrimination in selection, nicety in arrangement, and execution in detail, we cannot speak too highly of M. Mathieu's work. One of its great advantages is that he has grouped the various specimens together according to seven prevailing schools or epochs: the Byzantine, Carlovingian, Saxon, German, Romano-French, and Gothic—the last-mentioned forming two divisions; so that, though his first design was to form a prayer-book in the style of the ancient "*Hours of Our Lady*," yet by this arrangement the book is made equally serviceable for the study of the art, and may be used by the artist with all convenience as a manual.

The book opens with Greek illumination, as we should expect; it being well known that the art first attained a high degree of perfection in the Byzantine empire, comprising Greece, Asia Minor, Egypt, Calabria, and Otranto; but, after having reached a certain point of excellence, it seems to have remained stationary. In spite of their jewelled gorgeousness, an unvaried sameness and monotony pervades all the productions of this period, which, however, owing to the simplicity of the design, never pall. The influence exercised by this art over the western parts of Europe was effaced only by very slow degrees. Even in a much later age, Cimabue did not venture to depart from it, though he is frequently spoken of as the creator of a new national art. Giotto struck out the new path, and soon eclipsed the fame of his predecessors. A judicious selection from this school gives us a very fair notion of its excellence and position from the ninth to the twelfth century.

The Carolingian school of illumination owed much of its greatness to Alcuin; and we may extend the remark to the other arts and sciences of his day. He was pre-eminently a man of letters, his mind embracing the whole circle of learning then taught. As a grammarian, theologian, liturgist, architect, poet, and historian, he was equally well known. The diffusion of learning in all its branches over the empire of his patron, Charlemagne, and, in fact, wherever he had influence, was one of the great objects of his life. Literature suddenly began to flourish where before little had been heard but the clash of arms, and the sons of the conquering Franks were glad to accept the Saxon monks as their teachers. Alcuin himself was no mean artist. What is known as the "Bible of Charlemagne" is the result of his skill and patience, and remains to this moment in a perfect state of preservation. It was no ordinary hand that could produce this magnificent folio volume of 449 leaves, ornamented with a fine frontispiece in gold and colours, and enriched with other large illuminations, which bear witness as well to the surpassing ability of the artist, as to the perfection to which the art had attained at that early period. The large-sized initial letters are decorated with historic allusions and emblematic devices, disclosing both knowledge and skill. It was under the auspices of such a man, himself recoiling from no burden, that the Carolingian school was planted, developed in growth, and yielded the richest fruit, specimens of which are tastefully exhibited in the work of M. Mathieu. What strikes us as most strange is, that in the infancy of the art we meet with results which we should rather have supposed to be the products of its maturity.

Saxon art is most conspicuous in the eighth and ninth centuries. This period is all the more worthy of notice, as miniature-painting was rarely attempted in any country during the seventh and beginning of the eighth century. All study of the art of painting must begin with this date, and its history onwards to the fifteenth century can be traced only in illuminated books; to which, moreover, we must have recourse for information as to domestic manners and customs, dress civil or ecclesiastical, military equipments, and the like. At one period England was at the head of Europe in this branch of the arts, and only fell from her lofty position through the inroads of a devastating enemy, who overthrew the works of civilization, destroying what he could not understand. Manuscripts to the number of 700 perished in the flames of Croyland alone. The Anglo-Saxon illuminators had quite a fancy for the representation of grotesque animals, with heterogeneous limbs, twisting and twining about each other in playful struggle, a sort of running vignette by way of framework enclosing the text. How divergent in details from the Greek models!

The monastery of S. Gall introduces us to the German school, which flourished from the ninth to the twelfth century, and in which many nuns have gained a name either for their encouragement of the art, or for their own personal success in its cultivation. The "*Hortus Deliciarum*" of the Abbess Herrada of Landsberg, is a sort of encyclopædia which she compiled for the benefit of her sisters in religion, and gives us a good notion of the then monastic knowledge of painting, geography, mythology, philosophy and history ancient and ecclesiastical. Here are found, joined to the

knowledge of the Bible, an acquaintance with canon law, dogmatic and moral theology, music, and logic, and that, too, displayed in by no means contemptible Latin. In the tenth century a general decadence becomes manifest ; all notion of chiaro-oscuro seems lost. Germany, however, stands without a rival, and produces the best paintings of this period. Occasionally, too, in England and Italy some eminent genius forces himself into notice, as the Benedictional of Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester, by Godemann, still bears witness, being esteemed by connoisseurs as one of the most graceful and delicate productions of the Saxon school.

The next specimens are taken from the Romano-French period, between the tenth and twelfth century. We are introduced at once to great delicacy of workmanship and perfection of minute parts. In the middle of the latter century the art seems to have made a sudden advance, displaying greater vigour and richness of imagination, with a striking increase of precision in execution. The human countenance is better developed, the features more clearly marked ; there is an evident aim at more accurate delineation, and attempts at light and shade in the colouring. Henceforth France maintains a very high position ; her fame spreads over Europe, and she bestows its name upon the art, as Dante bears witness, when meeting Oderigi, the pride of his country :—

“ Oh, dissi lui, non se' tu Oderisi,
L'onor d'Agobbio, e l'onor di quell' arte,
Ch' *alluminare* è chiamata in Parisi ?”*

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries lead us on to the most tasteful Gothic illuminations. At this time the symbolism of Christian art was in its full vigour, and every stroke of the brush testifies to a labour of love. Raffaele was the last that caught the sacred flame, and he owed it to Perugino or to Baccio della Porta ; but, unfortunately for Christian art, and, consequently, for all true art whatever, he did not bequeath it to his disciples. After him, Christian symbolism, losing its significance, was perverted to unmeaning purposes, that betray a venal industry. What shall we say of the bunch of grapes, the sign of joy, in the hands of the Child Jesus or of His Holy Mother, being metamorphosed into a bunch of cherries under the hand of such an artist as Carracci ? or of Our Lady and Child with a dove, the emblem of a soul reposing under the protection of the Mother of God, becoming a *Madonna del gatto*, under that of Barroccio ? The pure, ennobling soul of symbolism and all depth of mystic thought and feeling disappeared in the sensualism of the sixteenth century, of whom Guido may be taken as a fair representative. As if the study of anatomy and of ancient Greek models could initiate an artist into the interior world of religion, known only by those who believe, hope, and love ! This is an order of things not taught or learnt in the studio ; but it was the guiding spirit of the early painters, who led a cloistered life, and it imparted to their works a charm which succeeding ages, in spite of the vast improvements inaugurated by the genius of Raffaele in the mechanical portion of art—correctness of design, and richness and truth of colouring—have vainly attempted to equal.

* Purgatorio, xi.

We have said that the work before us is well adapted, by its admirable arrangement, to be used either in the oratory or in the studio. It is also eminently a book for the drawing-room. Taste is created by opportunity of seeing and comparing ; and a taste for art will be engendered and nurtured by the study of the best artistic models, whether originals or copies.

In order further to promote this study, a second volume has been added to the "*Livre de Prières*," properly so called, which, within the compass of 250 pages of letterpress, gives a history of the art of illumination as practised in every country, from the earliest times of which we have any record or remains, together with a compendious narrative of the formation and character of each school. What confers on this supplementary volume a peculiar worth is, that it furnishes an explanation of all the illustrations given in the former part of the work, together with a notice of the particular book from which it has been so faithfully reproduced.

The highest commendations are due to the editor for the care with which the impressions have been worked off in this most difficult and delicate process of chromo-lithography. The paper is of the most durable make, resembling rather carton than paper, and the type of both volumes irreproachable. We can confidently recommend the work to the notice of our readers.

Vie de Fra Angelico de Fiesole, de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs. Par E. CARTIER. 8vo. Paris : Poussielgue-Rusand.

M. CARTIER'S life of Fra Angelico, though it made its appearance nearly six years ago, is of so much interest, that we cannot forbear introducing it, however late in the day, to the attention of our readers. The author is an enthusiastic admirer of Father Lacordaire, to whom he owed his first acquaintance with the *chef-d'œuvre* of Fra Angelico, in the convent of S. Mark, at Florence. From his lips he learnt the true principles of Christian art, and to him he dedicated a work written after his manner, and intended to give a high and holy idea of Christian art in general, and of the merits of Fra Angelico in particular.

In an elaborate and eloquent introduction, he unfolds his doctrine of the beautiful in art. Following in the footsteps of S. Thomas, he analyzes Creation as the great artistic work of God. Every being that is moulded by His hands bears the impress of Divine power, wisdom, and goodness, and is beautiful in proportion to the perfection with which it reflects them all. Hence moral beauty is essential to the perfection of physical and intellectual beauty ; and as the art of man ought to resemble the art of God, mere imitation of nature in its external forms cannot be its true end. If it exclude moral beauty, it necessarily remains gross and incomplete, for its end is the expression of moral beauty by means of that physical beauty which is its sign and symbol. It is impossible, then, that man should separate himself in the moral order from God, without losing, to a great extent, the power of producing the beautiful in art. Art by becoming pagan (and man in revolt against God is always pagan), loses its moral excellence, ceases to be just and

good, becomes false in its whole aim and object. On the contrary, as fallen man returns towards God, and is brought into communion with Him by the justice and goodness of the Word Incarnate, he regains the power of producing the beautiful in art, because he has found again justice and goodness in Jesus Christ, who at once purifies his soul to recognize moral beauty, and, in His own Person, as the God-man, presents him with the archetype and model of perfect beauty. Our Lord is at once the inspirer, the principle, and the end of all true art. What there was of moral beauty in the ancient art of Greece, or other heathen nations, was due to the fragments of primitive revelation which lingered on amongst mankind. When the pride of reason drove the religious element away, art rapidly degenerated into a state of degrading slavishness and vulgarity. Progress in the mechanical portions of the arts of painting and sculpture could not save them from insignificance and deformity. On the other hand, in all Christian art—by which is meant not the art of Christians so-called, but art animated by Christian principles—expression of moral beauty compensates in great measure for all defects in material treatment. Anatomical correctness, good drawing, harmony of colour, excellence of design, truth of detail, and judicious composition,—in a word, all that is purely technical or that merely pleases the senses—are necessary elements of mere physical beauty, but hold only a subordinate place amongst the requirements of genuine art. They can be better spared than moral beauty. Defective means may go far to spoil the excellence of a work of art ; but deprive it of its true end, and it ceases to be genuine art at all. A living body may, as a body, be very imperfect, yet because it is living, it is more beautiful than a corpse of the most admirable proportions. As moral beauty, therefore, is the soul of art, without it the most faultless composition is essentially dead and worthless. Upon these principles there is more vitality and truth in the rude paintings in the catacombs than in the most technically perfect work of unchristian artists. The latter may dazzle and overpower the senses, but the former charm and elevate the soul. “Religion,” says our author, “is the rule of moral beauty, and without moral beauty natural beauty becomes corrupt and vicious, and is stripped of all its glory. Without religion, art is but a frivolous amusement and a social danger. Religion alone can restore it to the original dignity of its sublime mission.”

It is with the desire of promoting the reunion of religion and art, that M. Cartier has written the life of Fra Angelico. He was pre-eminently a Christian artist, more entirely so than Raffaele ; for he was always faithful to the severe canons of Christian art, and never condescended to paint a single profane subject. “Surpassed by none in talent, he was a great painter and a great saint, thus reproducing in his life and in his works that likeness to God which is the one unchanging object of Christian art.”

The life of a painter is, of course, little more than the history of his works. Accordingly, M. Cartier devotes his opening chapter to the task of tracing Fra Angelico's parentage as a painter. Dividing the history of art in all nations into three periods—the hieratic, the scientific, and the naturalistic—in the second of which, art, as the equation of moral and physical beauty, attains its perfection, he fixes these periods in Italy as follows:—The first commences with the mosaics of Rome, and ends with Orcagna ; the second

is inaugurated by Ghiberti, and terminates with Raffaele ; the third dates from the Renaissance, and lasts down to the present day. Fra Angelico unites in his own person the perfections of the first period, whilst he forms the great model for the second. We are not prepared to accept M. Cartier's favourable judgment of Byzantine art, nor to assign to it so limited an influence on the style of the early Italian painters. On these points M. Rio, in his excellent work on the "Poetry of Christian Art," seems to us much truer to history. But we are glad to find that M. Cartier is less harsh than M. Rio in his criticisms of Cimabue. There is a nobility of form, and a grandeur of conception in the heads of Cimabue, to which Greek artists never attained, and do not seem to have aspired. Their method was stiff, conventional, and purely mechanical ; the features were ill drawn and devoid of expression ; there was no attempt at grouping or movement, while rich ornament and vivid colours were lavished on drapery and other accessories. Cimabue is far more free and natural, and aims at keeping detail in subordination to unity. The true regenerator of art, however, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, was Giotto, of whose school Fra Angelico was the last and noblest representative. On this school at least Greek art had but slight, and certainly no pernicious influence. Even Vasari, with all his prejudices in favour of the Renaissance, cannot withhold his admiration from the sweetness and purity of expression that distinguished Fra Angelico's frescoes. And Lanzi, struck with the freedom of his designs, the gracefulness of his forms, and the delicacy and harmony of his colouring, calls him, though the comparison is in other respects rather an injury than a compliment, the Guido of his age. Rio, Marchese, and Montalembert are the authors who have done most ample justice to his merits. To them M. Cartier owes much of his knowledge of facts, and some of his enthusiasm ; nor is he at all backward in recognizing their services. He has, however, made advances upon them. Several paintings heretofore believed to be Fra Angelico's, and which were in many respects damaging to his reputation, he has assigned to their true author, his brother—Fra Benedetto. He has also described more of Fra Angelico's paintings in detail, and has furnished, at the end of his volume, an excellent catalogue, geographically arranged, of a hundred and twenty-three of his pictures, the largest number, we believe, that has yet been attributed to him. We are happy to have to correct M. Cartier's catalogue in one matter of no small importance to ourselves. He gives England only five specimens of Fra Angelico, and places them all in private collections. The number has probably been much increased since the publication of his volume ; and our National Gallery now possesses one, at least, of this artist's finest works.

In his enthusiasm for Fra Angelico, M. Cartier sometimes runs into extravagance. We cannot join with him in decrying every artist who does not employ mystic symbolism in painting. Ecstasy is not the normal state of the soul in this life ; few ever attain it. Were we to exact it from artists, we should sadly thin their numbers, and, perhaps from want of spiritual perception in ourselves, might find the products of art monotonous if they were always of the Fra Angelico kind. It may be true that few pictures have converted so many persons to the faith as his are represented to have done, and it may

be true, also, that it needs the contemplative eye of a saint to catch a ray of the divine glories of Thabor, or the dazzling brightness of the risen life. But we do not think it necessarily profane or useless to admire and study, and even pray before, pictures which represent our Blessed Lord and His Holy Mother after a fashion less removed from the ordinary conceptions of the faithful—as we can imagine them really to have looked in the cottage or on Calvary, amidst the lowliness of Nazareth or the humiliations of the Cross. We cannot even grant that, to be satisfied with, and, possibly, at times to prefer, what some may deem a less exalted and more human style of painting, argues a less fervent piety or a lower degree of sanctity. We cling to this liberty in the gratification of devotional feeling, although content to have the taste regarded, artistically, as an imperfection.

We are glad to see an English translation of this work, by a member of the Dominican order, announced as shortly to appear.

Dialogue de Sainte Catharine de Sienné. Suivi de ses Prières, recueillies par ses Disciples, et de son Traité de la Perfection, d'après le Manuscrit du Vatican. Ouvrage traduit de l'Italien par E. CARTIER. 2 Tom. Paris : Poussielgue-Rusand.

Lettres de Sainte Catharine de Sienné. Traduites de l'Italien par E. CARTIER. 3 Tom. Paris : Poussielgue-Rusand.

IT has often been remarked that the present day, in which the Holy See has been assailed in a manner that reminds the historical student of the times of S. Catharine of Siena, and which has seen a pope brought back to Rome from exile, as Gregory XI. was brought back from Avignon, has also witnessed a great extension among the faithful of the devotion to the Saint just named. This increase of devotion has naturally reflected itself in the press. The works of M. Chavin de Malan are tolerably well known, even among ourselves ; and we have now to thank M. Cartier for giving us at least a French translation of S. Catharine's Dialogue and Letters. We trust that the time is not far distant when something of the kind may be attempted in our own country, where the Dominican order is making progress, and where works of no mean literary merit have been produced among the Sisters of Penance. The Life of the Saint, by B. Raymond, of Capua, has, indeed, been translated on the other side of the Atlantic ; but we have too much respect for the laudable piety of the attempt to say any thing as to its success.

The work now called the "Dialogue of Saint Catharine" was taken down from the lips of the Saint, while in ecstasy, by various secretaries. It was dictated in this marvellous manner about two years before her death. It begins with four requests made to God : first, for virtue for herself ; secondly, for the reform of the Church ; thirdly, for the conversion of the world, and especially for the salvation and peace of those Christians who were persecuting the Church so cruelly ; fourthly, for the special succour of Divine Providence for all, and for a particular case. The answers to these

requests go over the whole sphere of the Christian life, and trace the path by which the soul is to arrive at union with God: the length of the way, the hindrances to be surmounted, the means that are to be employed, and the rewards that will crown success. The whole work used to be called the "Book of Divine Doctrine"—or, as it appears in the standard edition of Gigli, the "Treatise of Divine Providence." Its most common name, however, is that given it on M. Cartier's title-page. It has been subdivided into treatises on Discretion, Prayer, Providence, and Obedience; and these again have been broken up into chapters, to which separate titles have been given; but all these divisions do not belong to the original text. There have been some translations of it made into Latin and French, and perhaps into other languages; the Latin, although one of them was made by Raymond of Capua himself, have always been considered as inferior to the original. M. Cartier has translated from the Italian.

The Letters of S. Catharine have probably been far more widely read than the Dialogue. They have its unction and spirituality, joined to the practical force and keenness given by having a special person and a special occasion in view. They have been the favourite reading of many saints. The mere names of the persons to whom they are addressed set before us vividly the extraordinary character of the active portion of her career. Popes, cardinals, bishops, kings, queens, princes, soldiers, magistrates, and feudal lords, as well as private individuals of every rank, sex, and calling, figure among those to whom she addresses herself. In the midst of this crowd, she is always the same—simple, earnest, vehement and intense in expression, yet humble and charitable, and overflowing with the richest spiritual lore. Her method is scarcely ever varied: after the invocation with which almost all her letters begin, "Al nome di Jesu Cristo Crocifisso, e di Maria dolce," she as it were throws herself upon the person she is addressing with some ardent prayer for a particular blessing: with this she connects either a question or a statement of some great truth, from which she draws conclusions or consequences that touch the point she has in view. The letters end with a beautiful salutation: "Abide in the holy love of God—Jesu dolce, Jesu amore!" They give us some means of understanding what historians tell us of the marvellous power of her words on certain occasions. Some of them were taken down from her lips while in ecstasy, as was the Dialogue. When she has occasion to relate anything, her style is clear, bright, and full of feeling. We may point, as an example, to that most beautiful letter in which she gives an account to her confessor of one of her noble acts of charity, when she had gone to visit in his dungeon a young man most unjustly condemned to death, whose patience and resignation had given way under his wrongs; and after converting and soothing him, she had accompanied him to the scaffold, knelt by him at the block, and received his head into her arms (vol. ii. p. 359).

The veneration in which she was held, as well as the great influence of her letters, is attested by the number of them that have been preserved. We may show this by a comparison with the fate of similar remains in the case of other saints. S. Francis Xavier's letters extend over a period of twelve years (we exclude, on purpose, one isolated letter, the earliest of all, which

would extend the time to seventeen)—S. Catharine's letters range, at the most, over eight years ; but we have not far short of three times the number of her letters, as compared with what exist of his. S. Teresa's correspondence embraces a period longer than either, by several years ; but, notwithstanding the comparatively recent date, we have fewer of these relics of her mind and heart than of S. Catharine's. The latter, moreover, has always been considered one of the great authors of the Italian language. "Fu non meno pulita nello scrivere, che incontaminata nel vivere," is the testimony of Maffei. Her language is rich in many words and expressions peculiar to herself, and a vocabulary has been published for her writings alone. M. Cartier has translated carefully from the celebrated edition of Gigli, which was most copiously and learnedly illustrated by Fr. Burlamacchi. Our author—probably from fear of making his volumes too bulky—has been very sparing in his use of the notes of the industrious Jesuit. "Nous avons profité," he says, "de son érudition, en négligeant toutefois ce qui n'offrait aucun intérêt pour la France." There may be a good deal in the notes of Burlamacchi "uninteresting to France;" but this is hardly a good reason for omitting eight or nine-tenths of the matter they contain. He has also altered the arrangement of the Letters, as found in Gigli's edition, preserving his general division, based upon the classes of persons to whom they are addressed, but separating historical letters from spiritual, and putting together in the same volume all that relate to the affairs of the Church and the pacification of Italy. We fear that the division between "spiritual" and "historical" letters must sometimes have been rather arbitrary. It would have been better, if possible, to give us the letters in chronological order. Such an arrangement, however, might have made more obvious and glaring the want of a connecting biographical commentary. In fact, the real history of S. Catharine, and of her influence upon her times, has yet to be written ; and any competent author who would devote himself to the task would do a great service to the history of the Church. With relation to this subject, we cannot conclude without specially thanking M. Cartier for the chronological table of the chief events in S. Catharine's life, which he has inserted in his first volume balancing, however, the expression of our gratitude by the remark, that a book like this ought not to be without a general index.

Œuvres Spirituelles de Saint Pierre d'Alcantara. Précédées du Portrait Historique du Saint par Sainte Térèse. Traduites en Français par le P. MARCEL BOUX, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Paris et Lyon : Perisse.

IT is very natural for the translator of S. Teresa's works and letters to pass on to the writings of S. Peter of Alcantara. The important part played by S. Peter with regard to S. Teresa is well known. It was his authority that settled her own misgivings, and the difficulties of others, as to the extraordinary favours received by her in prayer. It was also owing, in a great degree, to his exertions and influence, that her Reform was first started, and based on the most perfect principles, viz., of poverty and reliance upon Providence. P. Bouix has united the two saints still more closely in the

pages before us. They contain large portions of S. Teresa's writings as well as those of S. Peter. First, we have S. Teresa's celebrated description of her saintly adviser, taken from her autobiography. Then, many of the meditations contained in S. Peter's treatise on Prayer are followed by extracts from S. Teresa on the same subject. Finally, the explanation of the Paternoster, found in her "Path of Perfection," is given entire, by way of supplement. The volume also contains the bull of S. Peter's canonization.

It is not necessary for us either to analyze or to recommend afresh works as well known as those of S. Peter. We may, however, enter briefly upon one or two critical questions connected with the writings he has left. In the first place, anyone who knows V. Louis of Granada's treatise on Prayer, will recognise, not merely the likeness, but the identity, of parts of that work with the treatise here given as the work of S. Peter. Again, in the volume before us, the celebrated document giving reasons for approving the spirit of S. Teresa's prayer, about the authorship of which some controversy has been raised, is attributed, without any doubt, to S. Peter. Lastly, the readers of Alban Butler may remember that he has ascribed to S. Peter a certain work on the Peace of the Soul, which is not included in the volume before us.

The first difficulty is not easily settled, so, at least, as to decide satisfactorily to which of the two authors the matter and arrangement of the treatise are to be attributed. The subject has been the occasion, as was natural, of a lively controversy between the writers of the two orders to which the claimants belong. Dominicans and Alcantarines have wielded their pens, and much ink has been shed on either side of the question. The identity of matter is beyond all dispute. Each book contains two sets of meditations, identical in subject, and, to a great extent, in language, save that one is at times more copious than the other, and the set which is first with S. Peter is second with Louis of Granada. S. Peter makes six parts of Prayer, V. Louis five; there is a similar general correspondence as to the recommendations given by each for the exercise of prayer, as to the enumeration of impediments and helps to devotion, the remedies to temptations to which those who pray are liable, and so on. There is here and there a difference in the number of heads, and now and then one is developed at length by S. Peter, which Louis of Granada treats concisely; more frequently the reverse is the case. The only question is, which had the work of the other before him; and the points of divergence become chiefly interesting as showing the topics and thoughts on which one of the two writers was particularly fond of dwelling, or which occurred to him as useful by way of supplement to what had been said by the other. The question has been elaborately discussed in the Bollandist Life of S. Peter; but the minutiae of the controversy are far too intricate for us to find room for them here. The internal evidence may be said, on the whole, to be in favour of the original authorship of Louis of Granada. It seems, on such grounds, more probable that S. Peter abridged the work of the Dominican, with some slight changes and additions of his own, than that the latter took S. Peter's work and amplified it. It is said also to be unlikely that Louis of Granada would have dealt in this way with the work of a person so well known and venerated in Spain as S. Peter, without any acknowledgment. On the other hand, S. Peter, in an alleged letter to the

friend at whose request he wrote, states that he has taken the best parts of works that he had read and made a compendium of their substance. This seems to favour the hypothesis that he was a copyist. But there are external difficulties of no slight weight against this conclusion. Some early writers distinctly claim for S. Peter's writings, that they served for the foundation of the work of Louis of Granada ; and the book of the former appears to have been published seven years or so before that of the latter. With so much conflict and uncertainty of evidence, it is not easy to decide the question. There is a great deal of confusion as to dates in the early Lives of S. Peter of Alcantara, and we cannot depend for perfect accuracy on the statements there found as to his having composed the work at a certain place or time. Still, the evidence of the printed editions is strongly in his favour, and is independent of the statements to which we alluded, and which the Bollandist writer justly depreciates. Moreover, the letter mentioned above, in which S. Peter states that he had taken from other writers, is, by the confession of the same critic, of very doubtful authority. We are inclined, therefore, to think that the arguments drawn from internal evidence are not so conclusive as to oblige us to suppose the original author to have been Louis of Granada. The Bollandist writer cannot get over the difficulty as to the dates of publication, except by inventing an entirely gratuitous hypothesis : that S. Peter had the manuscript or the notes of Louis before him when he wrote, although his own work was the first to be printed and published. There is no insuperable difficulty in the silence of Louis of Granada as to his having made S. Peter's work the foundation of his own. We think that it was not uncommon in writers of that time to look more to producing a good work for their readers, from whatever sources, original or borrowed, than to being very particular about acknowledging their debts to their predecessors. Original writers were few ; they gave to a common and important subject, such as Prayer, its form and distribution ; according to which it was treated by those that followed them, with more or less of novelty on particular points, and very often with none. There was probably extant, in those days, some common distribution of the subjects to be handled by a writer on meditation and devotion, which both S. Peter and Louis of Granada have followed : if not, we are inclined to think that both the arrangement and the matter of the Treatise on Prayer and Devotion should be attributed to S. Peter. If Louis of Granada used the earlier work without scruple, he only did what was very commonly done by writers on ascetics and dogmatic or moral theology, and by the authors of sermons. A thorough redistribution of property on the *suum cuique* principle would leave many an author of all times, and of our own not less than any other generation, in a rather penniless condition.

The second question to be dealt with relates to a long document containing 33 Articles, which are, in fact, so many reasons for thinking that the wonderful favours received by S. Teresa in prayer are not to be considered as delusions of the enemy of souls. Boucher and other writers have attributed it to Fr. Ybañez, of the Dominican order, who certainly sent to S. Teresa a treatise on the Discernment of Spirits. It is supposed that the document in question is an epitome of this treatise. Ypez, however, who had certainly

seen the production of Fr. Ybañez, distinctly states that the author of the 33 Articles is a different writer. He is inclined to attribute them to some Jesuit Father, and supposes them to have been sent by him to the Venerable John of Avila, as arguments in favour of the opinion that S. Teresa was not deceived. But the Society of Jesus is spoken of in the course of the document in a way that seems to show that its author was not one of its children. A third opinion attributes the Articles to S. Peter of Alcantara, whom S. Teresa is well known to have consulted on the matter. No objection lies against this opinion, except that drawn from the fact that S. Teresa makes no mention of this document when she speaks of her intercourse with S. Peter. Arguments from silence are always dangerous; and it is well known that the autobiography of S. Teresa omits a great many certain facts that it is surprising she should not have remembered. There is also positive evidence in favour of S. Peter's authorship. The postulator of the cause of S. Peter's beatification ascertained the fact from documentary evidence, and the Articles are given as his by the author of the Franciscan Annals.

As to the work on the Peace of the Soul, there seems to be no reason for attributing it to S. Peter. We may remark that the two modern authorities, Butler and Rohrbacher, who give it as his, are in reality but one. The latter has copied word for word, with hardly the slightest alteration, the whole *Life* of S. Peter as it stands in Butler: consequently the sentence about this treatise is contained in his pages. This is, perhaps, one of the least defensible instances of the habit of wholesale borrowing by which some modern writers fill volume after volume. There is no mention made of any such work of S. Peter's by the historians of his order, nor by the collectors of Spanish literature, nor by the biographers of the Saint. S. Teresa speaks of him as having written "little books that are in the hands of all;" and there have been those who believed that there must be some other work answering to her description, besides the *Treatise on Prayer*. But that treatise consists of more than one part, and S. Teresa probably was thus led to use the plural number.

La Solitaire des Rochers: sa Correspondance avec son Directeur, éditée, d'après plusieurs Manuscrits, avec son Histoire, par NICOLSON et BÉRAULT-BERCASTEL; et une Dissertation Critique par P. BOUX, Docteur en Théologie, etc. Paris et Lyon: Périsse.

SOME twenty years ago two editions appeared in France, of a collection of letters which had been privately, but extensively, circulated in manuscript since the beginning of the last century. The letters were, or professed to be, the correspondence between a woman who was living an entirely solitary life, in the midst of a forest, apparently in the south-west of France, and her director, P. Luc de Bray, a Franciscan, who was *curé* of a small parish at Châteaufort, a few miles from Paris. Who the recluse herself was, remained matter of conjecture, though she was generally supposed to be a lady of the noble house of Montmorency. The letters themselves were highly esteemed on account of the spiritual teaching contained in them—

though it appears that more value was usually attached to the Solitary's share in the correspondence than to that of her Director. Although the letters do not seem to have been published till the date we have mentioned, two short lives of the Solitary appeared in the latter half of the last century—one by Nicolson, a Dominican, but, apparently, somewhat tainted with Jansenism; and another by Bérault-Bercastel, in the eightieth book of his *History of the Church*. They do not, however, contain much definite information beyond what might have been gathered from the letters themselves, supposing them to have been handed about with traditional explanations of passages in which allusion is made to the previous life of the Solitary. It therefore still remains not quite determined whether the Solitary ever existed, or whether she was not a creation of the author of the Letters. If we except the letters, no traces exist of any such person: no place has ever been discovered which answers to the description she gives of her two retreats—for from one she represents herself as migrating, after a time, to another; no part of the country has preserved any tradition of such an inhabitant at the date assigned, or claims to possess her grave.

The present work of M. Bouix is meant to be a help to the solution of the question concerning this extraordinary woman. He does not pretend himself to settle the controversy, but he hopes to place all the available evidence at the disposal of those who may come after him. He has printed the letters from a manuscript of 1783, collating three others with the two printed editions mentioned before. He tells us, however, that he has taken some slight liberties with the text: "Nous nous sommes permis, tout en respectant le sens, de couper les phrases, de substituer des synonymes à des expressions obscures ou vieilles, de remplacer, par des équivalents, des membres de phrase qui auraient embarrassé le lecteur ou fatigué son attention" (xi). To meet the objection that may be fairly raised against this treatment of the original, he has deposited his manuscripts, for the inspection of the public, at his publishers—an expedient hardly likely to satisfy any very fastidious critic. He has also given us, at full length, the lives of the Recluse by Nicolson and Bérault-Bercastel, followed by a critical dissertation of his own, in which the disputed points are fully discussed. We should add that, besides the question as to the truth of the history, there is another to be settled as to the present state of the letters, which have been supposed in some places to have been falsified by Jansenist hands. M. Bouix, however, decides both points in favour of the letters. He thinks that there is no solid reason for doubting the actual existence of the Solitary, and that the correspondence does not present any signs of interpolation or corruption in any material point.

It appears to be tolerably certain that Père Luc de Bray, the good and venerated *curé* of the church at Châteaufort, circulated these letters as the correspondence between himself and the Solitary. De la Beaumelle, in his "*Mémoires de Madame de Maintenon*," states this fact; but he adds that the letters were discovered to be forgeries, and that the Père de Bray died of shame at the exposure. De la Beaumelle was apparently a Voltairian, and as a writer he must rank with Marsollier, "*le plus infidèle des biographes*," and others, as having imposed on the world a false view of the character he had undertaken to illustrate. He is a good witness as to the fact that these

letters were circulated during the lifetime of Madame de Maintenon, and that De Bray himself attested their genuineness. As, however, it is certain that De Bray lived and died highly honoured and venerated, and that his whole character was quite above suspicion, the assertion of De la Beaumelle respecting the detection of the imposition must be considered as an invention of his own. Internal evidence also precludes the supposition that he forged the letters addressed to himself, which sometimes speak of him and others—among whom is the Archbishop of Paris, De Harlay—in terms which no forger would be likely to use. If the story of the Solitary were a romance, it is also fair to say that it would have been made more romantic than it is. She leaves her family, in order to escape a projected marriage, at the age of fifteen or sixteen—a fact which coincides with what is known to have happened in the noble family already mentioned, about the same time. But she spends some years as a servant at Paris and Auxerre, and afterwards, as it appears, in complete poverty, again at Paris and Châteaufort; and it is not till her forty-fifth year that she settles in her solitude, “*Les Rochers*.” Her history has, in fact, to be gathered and put together from passing allusions scattered through the letters, and it is hardly such, in itself, as a romancer would think it worth his while to invent. There are also one or two items of external evidence which support the theory of the real existence of the Solitary. Père de Bray gave a wooden crucifix that she had carved and sent to him, to Madame de Maintenon, and it was to be seen, when Bérault-Bercastel wrote, at a convent in Paris. It appears, also, that search was actually made, by order of the Procureur-Général of the Parliament of Paris, for the place of the Solitary’s retirement, and for any vestiges or relics of her that might exist. Feller also has to be added to the list of writers who have mentioned her, and he is a believer in her real existence, as well as the others. And, to return to internal evidence, the letters themselves bear witness at least to a double authorship: unless the forger was a more skilful composer than the good Cordelier is likely to have been, it seems improbable that he could have counterfeited the diversity of character so ably; and, perhaps, also, that he would have made himself play the inferior part in the correspondence.

The question of falsification is not quite so clearly settled by M. Bouix. The passages which have been supposed to contain marks of Jansenist interference are several in number. There are some strong expressions against the method of direction used by a *Père G*—, in whose hands the Solitary seems once to have been. Nicolson fills up the blank with the name of Père Guilloré, who wrote before the question of Quietism was raised, and whose works have been thought to have a tendency in that direction. It seems, at all events, that many manuscripts contained the name as Nicolson read it; others have the *Père Gardin*. It may, however, still be possible that Père Guilloré is the person named, and that he may not have well understood the particular character of the Solitary. There are also some strong passages against Fénelon’s book, the “*Maxims of the Saints*,” which it seems unlikely that so humble and retiring a person as the Solitary would have written; but they find their explanation in the fact that, in the previous letter, her director had given her a positive command to express her opinion. There are also

some passages from which it appears that she sometimes abstained from Communion from the beginning of Lent until Holy Thursday ; and her director does not forbid this abstinence. On the other hand, it is clear that her communions were ordinarily frequent—three times a week regularly, and during Octaves, every day. If, therefore, the Jansenists interpolated the abstinence from Communion during Lent, they left other passages untouched which tell against their favourite practice. But it is not *impossible* that an individual soul might be led occasionally to abstain for some length of time from Holy Communion. There is, however, at least one certain trace of a Jansenist hand in some of the manuscripts. Speaking of bad principles with regard to confession, the Solitary places Jansenius between Molinos and Calvin. The manuscripts in question leave out the name of Jansenius.

On the whole, there is no sufficient ground for supposing either that the whole work is a forgery, or that the Letters have come down to us in a materially garbled form. It is well known that from time to time, amid the thousand paths along which souls are led by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, extraordinary vocations, such as that of the Solitary, occur in the history of the Church. The manner of life and the austerities described in the volume before us, do not surpass what is known to have been, for several years, the ordinary life, diet, and penance of the celebrated Catharine of Cardona, who had been at one time the *gouvernante* of Don Carlos and Don John of Austria, and who, while engaged in intense prayer for the success of the Christian fleet, received the same supernatural intimation of the victory of Lepanto, at the moment that it took place, as S. Pius V. It may appear strange that nothing should ever have been known of the Solitary except from the collection of letters before us, and that no place should ever have been found that answered to the description she gives of her two abodes. But the Letters themselves terminate abruptly, on account of the death of Père de Bray ; and in her last communication she mentions her desire to go on foot to Rome, for the jubilee which was to take place the next year. She may have gone, and never have returned ; and, however great her sanctity, it may not have been according to the dispositions of Providence to make it conspicuous, either at her death or afterwards, by any supernatural manifestations. The singular path along which she was led, made her rather admirable than imitable. She had no mission to the world around her, as Catharine of Cardona had to the Court of Spain ; yet, even in the case of the latter, we do not find any mention of miracles either before or after her death, although there may have been many, none of which have been recorded.

Sixth Report of the Inspector appointed under the provisions of the Act 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 38, to visit the Certified Reformatory and Industrial Schools of Great Britain. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1863.

AS Catholics have happily been placed by the Legislature on an equality with Protestants in the institution of Reformatories and Industrial Schools, and as all such certified establishments are visited and reported on by the same Inspector, his annual reports possess necessarily a considerable

interest for us. The Rev. Sydney Turner, as far as we may judge from his reports, seems to fulfil his delicate and difficult duties with great fairness and judgment. We do not propose, in this notice of the Report just issued, to enter into all the various subjects that it suggests, but the two most important matters mentioned in it are of such paramount consequence and touch our institutions so very closely, that we consider it a duty to place them before our readers. Mr. Sydney Turner contrasts the Protestant and the Catholic Reformatories in the two particulars of the number of deaths occurring in them, and the number of inmates discharged from them who have been reconvicted of crime, during the year 1862; and we observe with regret that the comparison is unfavourable to the Catholic Reformatories.

We take first the subject of health. The following is the Inspector's Report :—

"The deaths amounted to 11 for the English Protestant schools, and to 12 for English Catholic ones, on an average population of 2,676 and 664 respectively; and to 10 for Scotch Protestant, and 5 for Scotch Catholic reformatories, on an average population of 690 and 247 respectively. The far superior healthfulness of the English Protestant schools is remarkable, and is to be ascribed to the cheerful, active tone of the schools, rather than to any difference either in the class the inmates are taken from or in their dietary and treatment, these being now, with such diversity as national habits require, much the same for all."—*Report for 1862*, p. 11.

We extract from the Appendices of the present Report, as well as from that of the previous year, the numbers of the inmates of each Catholic Reformatory, together with the numbers of the deaths in each :—

	1861.		1862.	
	Inmates.	Deaths.	Inmates.	Deaths.
ENGLAND.				
Boys—Mount St. Bernard's ...	214	1	189	6
Market Weighton	203	...	204	1
Brook Green	105	1	104	—
Girls—Arno's Court	182	2	144	5
Yorkshire	19	—
SCOTLAND.				
Boys—Parkhead	115	2	165	4
Girls—Dalbeth	63	...	82	1
	882	6	907	17

There has certainly been a larger loss than usual in 1862 in the three Reformatories of Mount S. Bernard's, Arno's Court, and Parkhead; but it will be observed that in the former year, though the number of deaths was above the average, the rate was not a high one. But it is difficult to see how the increased number of deaths is to be attributed to a want of a "cheerful, active tone in the schools." Setting aside Mount S. Bernard's, which, unfortunately, has been for some time in an exceptional position, the Report of the Inspector does not lead us to believe that there has been any falling off in either of the two other Reformatories. Of Arno's Court he says (p. 29) that he "found the whole establishment in its usual excellent order." He also

tells us that "the laundry and needlework furnish as usual the chief means of employment; but I found a good many of the younger girls engaged also in cultivating the garden and grounds attached to the convent. There had been but little serious punishment, the general conduct of the girls having been much more satisfactory than in past years." This does not look like a want of a "cheerful, active tone," or a deterioration in this respect of such a character that the increase of the number of deaths is to be ascribed to it. And of Parkhead Mr. Sydney Turner says (p. 53), "A marked improvement in its general state had taken place since my previous inspection, and I found reason to be very well satisfied with the healthful appearance of the boys as well as with their cheerfulness and order." This again does not seem like a case that would suggest to the Inspector the "far superior healthfulness of the English Protestant schools." Certainly Market Weighton and Dalbeth, that had no death in 1861 and only one each in 1862, or Brook Green, that had one death in 1861 and none in 1862, cannot have suggested the Inspector's unfavourable view of the healthfulness of Catholic schools. We cannot think that the facts bear out his inference.

The Protestant Reformatories in Great Britain had 21 deaths in 1861 out of 3,269 inmates, and the same number in 1,862 out of the slightly increased number of inmates, which for that year was 3,347. The proportion of deaths to the number of inmates was therefore '64 per cent. in 1861 and '62 in 1862; while in the Catholic Reformatories it was '68 in 1861; and in consequence, as we have seen, of the increased number of losses in three institutions, it was almost 1·9 per cent. in 1862. In 1861 the Catholic deaths were about in the same proportion as the Protestant deaths; and with respect to the increased proportion of Catholic deaths in 1862, it must be remembered that, in such small numbers, two or three additional deaths make a great difference in the per-centage.

The Certified Industrial Schools present a very similar return to that of the Reformatories. S. Nicholas's School for Boys at Walthamstow, S. George's School for Boys at Liverpool, the Girls' School in York Street, Westminster, S. Margaret's Home for Girls, and the Glasgow Catholic Orphanage for Boys and Girls, have had no death during the past year. But S. George's Girls' School at Liverpool has had 3, and S. Elizabeth's Girls' School, also at Liverpool, has had 1; and these raise our proportion largely. There were thus 4 Catholic deaths out of 173 inmates, or 2·3 per cent.; while there were but 6 Protestant deaths out of 776 inmates, or '78 per cent. But the occurrence of 3 deaths in a year in a single school would by no means justify a sweeping censure of all Catholic schools as negligent of the health of their inmates. We repeat that we do not wish in any way to impugn Mr. Sydney Turner's spirit of fairness; but we have the grounds of his judgment before us, and we do not consider them as substantiating the conclusion to which he has arrived.

We now turn to the not less important subject of re-convictions. Here again poor Mount S. Bernard's comes in to swell the numbers to the disadvantage of the Catholic Reformatories, inasmuch as of the 335 boys discharged from it, no less than 83 were re-convicted in 1862. In the table given in the Report (p. 121) we have the actual numbers for all the

Reformatories in England and Wales ; but as it is difficult from them to compare one with another, we have compiled from the data given in the Report another table. In it the first column of figures is that of the average inmates for last year, and the second column gives the per-centage of those re-convicted out of the numbers discharged. The table does not include Scotland.

Boys.	Inmates.	Re-convicted.
Mount S. Bernard's (Catholic)	189	25 per cent. of boys
Manchester and Salford	39	17·6 [discharged.
Market Weighton (Catholic)	204	15
Bedford.....	34	12
Warwickshire	68	12
Woodbury Hill.....	28	11·4
"Cornwall," ship	197	10
Hardwicke	38	9
Calder Farm.....	90	9
Brook Green (Catholic)	104	7·5
North-Eastern	110	6·6
Cumberland.....	41	6
Berks	(not given)	6
Leeds.....	56	5·4
Buxton	29	5·3
Saltley	72	5
Red Hill	250	4·2
Home in the East	65	4
Stoke	46	4
Devon	30	3·7
Dorset	26	3·3
Herts.....	39	3·3
Kingswood	97	3·2
North Lancashire.....	51	2·2
"Akhbar," ship	158	2
Castle Howard.....	45	2
Bradwall	58	1
Boys' Home	172	0·9

The following have had no re-convictions in 1862 :—Liverpool Farm, 67 inmates ; Hants, 50 ; Suffolk, 39 ; Wilts, 33 ; Glamorgan, 33 ; Northampton, 27 ; Essex, 22 ; Sunderland, 21 ; Monmouth, 12 ; Leicestershire, number of inmates not given.

GIRLS.	Inmates.	Re-convicted.
Arno's Court (Catholic)	144	11 per cent. of girls
Birmingham	41	7·7 [discharged.
West Riding.....	18	7·7
Toxteth Park	26	6
Red Lodge	65	3·8
Hampstead	90	3·6
Liverpool	54	3·2
Allesley.....	19	2·5

The following have had no re-convictions in 1862 :—Devon, 60 ; Sunderland, 41 ; Limpley Stoke, 37 ; Doncaster, 34 ; Ipswich, 30 ; Yorkshire (Catholic), 19 ; Surrey, 8 ; the Rescue does not give the number of its inmates.

Mr. Sydney Turner sums up the returns thus :—

“ The re-convictions for English reformatories, as tested by the gaol returns for the year, amounted to nearly 5 per cent. on the number discharged from Protestant boys’ and Protestant girls’ schools, to 11 per cent. for those from Catholic girls’, and to 18 per cent. for those from Catholic boys’ schools. In justice to the two Catholic reformatories of Market Weighton and Brook Green, it should be stated that 83 of the 107 re-convictions of Catholic boys belonged to Mount S. Bernard’s Reformatory, which has become, unhappily, notorious for bad management and ill success, and which is now under suspension until placed on a better footing. Deducting the discharges and the re-convictions belonging to this reformatory from the above figures, there would be 236 and 24 respectively for the two other Catholic boys’ reformatories, showing a per-centage of re-convictions of 10 per cent.

“ The per-centage of re-convictions for the Scotch Reformatories appears to be, for Protestant boys nearly 6 per cent., for Protestant girls 5 per cent. ; for Catholic boys 15 per cent., and for Catholic girls 54 per cent.”—*Report*, p. 6.

The last item sounds enormous in its per-centage shape. It means that 11 girls were discharged from Dalbeth, of whom 6 were recommitted to prison.

We have arranged the Reformatories in the table given above so as to enable us to see at a glance whether the large Reformatories return a disproportionately large number of re-convictions ; but it will be observed that it is not so. A very small Reformatory heads the list, if no account be taken of Mount S. Bernard’s ; and Red Hill, which contains 250 boys, and the Boys’ Home, which has 172, are very low down. Nor are the reformatory ships much distinguished from the other institutions ; for while the “ Akhbar ” hulk at Liverpool is very low, the “ Cornwall,” off Purfleet, is high in the list.

Mr. Sydney Turner very sensibly says :—

“ Many, if not most, of the failures may be traced to the want of care and supervision on discharge. The lad or young woman who passes at once from the restraint of school to the licence of free life, and comes again without protection or oversight under the influence of a disorderly home and depraved associates, must be expected, in a majority of cases, to fall back into the loose habits and the idleness which have mainly caused their former depravation. . . . Much more care is also taken as to the mode and circumstances of disposal. On this point the smaller schools have an undoubted advantage over the larger ones ; their means of finding employment are proportionally larger, and the facility of supervision after discharge much greater.”—*Report*, p. 10.

Now, it is instructive to observe, that of the boys discharged in 1861 and 1862 respectively, from Mount S. Bernard’s, no less than 169 and 50 are “ returned to friends,” and only 20 and 10 “ to employment or service.” And so again at Market Weighton, which stands very high in the list, no less than 15 per cent. of discharged boys having been re-convicted in 1862, 24 and 26 of those discharged during the two years “ returned to friends,”

and 8 and 6 to "employment or service." But, on the other hand, at Brook Green, where the re-convictions are just half the per-centage of Market Weighton, 37 and 14 boys "returned to friends," and 35 and 24 to "employment or service."

In this matter, we Catholics labour under very serious disadvantages ; for, on the one hand, the boys committed to our Reformatories belong to a class that has much more difficulty in finding permanent employment than is the case with the boys who are sent to Protestant Reformatories ; and, on the other hand, we have no large middle class whom we might interest in their favour, and with whom, on discharge from the Reformatory, they might obtain employment. But it will not do for us to say that, because the work is difficult, it is not to be done, unless we wish to be left behind in the race, and to have it declared that Protestant Reformatories can restore criminal boys to a decent life, and that, comparatively speaking, Catholic Reformatories fail to do so. The fault will be laid on the Reformatories, though they will not deserve it. However excellent a boy's training may have been for a few years, he will certainly fall back into criminal habits, if we allow him to return to the scene of his former temptations. The blame of his relapse into crime will be due, not to the Reformatory he has left, but to those who have been unwilling to assist him at the most critical moment of his life. Now, for this some organization is needed. If, some little while before the discharge of boys and girls, as well from Reformatories as from Industrial Schools, their names and capabilities were to be sent to some charitable persons who, for the love of God, would undertake so necessary a work, and if Catholics generally would remember to make application in this quarter when they have an opportunity of giving employment to one of these boys or girls, the proportion of Catholics who have been in Reformatories and who find their way back to prison would soon be diminished. The "Patronage Work" of the Society of S. Vincent de Paul has undertaken for boys this very charity, but it is on an inadequately small scale ; and while they have many applications on the part of boys for situations, they have hardly any applications from employers for boys, and their advertisements are quite disregarded. Unfortunately, too, a little money is often wanted to equip a boy for service and, more certainly, to send him to any distance. Yet this is the great need. Would it not be possible, by the help of the Society of S. Vincent de Paul or in some other way, to induce Catholic farmers in the North of England to take boys from London, and London employers to take those from the North ? Mr. Sydney Turner's suggestion, that small Reformatories in this respect have an advantage over the larger ones, would not, we think, be found to be true in the case of Catholic schools, which could not look to the gentry or middle class in their respective neighbourhoods to befriend the boys whom they discharge. It is in the disposal of their boys that the ship Reformatories excite our envy. Last year the "Cornwall" sent 39 boys to sea, and the "Akhbar" 41.

We pass over several interesting points in the Report, such as the Industrial Returns and the expenses of the various institutions ; but, as in our third Article, we have given the proportion of Catholics in prison, so, for the sake of comparison, we here give the average number of those in the Reformatories

and Industrial Schools during the year 1862, and thus close our notice of Mr. Sydney Turner's last Report.

In the English Reformatories,—

Of 2,631 boys, 497 were Catholics, or nearly 19 per cent.

Of 686 girls, 163 were Catholics, or 23·76 per cent.

In the Scotch Reformatories,—

Of 716 boys, 165 were Catholics, or 23 per cent.

Of 221 girls, 82 were Catholics, or 37 per cent.

Of the total inmates of English and Scotch Reformatories,—

The Catholics were 907 out of 4,254, or 21·3 per cent.

And in the Industrial Schools in England,—

Of 366 boys, 79 were Catholics, or 21·6 per cent.

And of 165 girls, 94 were Catholics, or 57 per cent.

Education in Itself and in its Relation to Present Wants: a Lecture delivered in S. Andrew's School, Glasgow, June 12, 1863. By J. B. PARKINSON, S.J., Superior of S. Aloysius's College, Glasgow. London: Burns & Lambert.

IN this very interesting and able lecture, F. Parkinson is far more occupied in starting a number of most important questions than in adequately treating any one of them. This was inevitable when only one lecture could be devoted to so wide a theme; and it will of course be still less possible for us, in a short notice, to treat this theme with any kind of satisfactoriness. Yet we hope we may do some service, if we merely indicate and distinguish from each other the various questions involved.

Under the common name of *education*, two most widely different processes are comprised: *moral* education, and *intellectual* education. Supposing for a moment that there had been no revelation of supernatural truths, by moral education would be understood the training the soul to contemplate and love God; to live in His remembrance; to love our fellow-men for His sake; to perform faithfully the various duties of life from a regard to His Will and Command. With the Catholic, moral and spiritual education includes indeed all this; but it includes a great deal more. It includes the imparting a knowledge of Jesus and Mary, and of the Catholic doctrines which directly affect practice; the inbuing its recipients with a love for the great Objects of faith, and with the habit of conforming their lives to the great Model; the instructing them to receive the sacraments with due dispositions; and other results of a like character. On the other hand, by intellectual education is meant the training men to analyze their various convictions and the grounds thereof; to argue correctly and readily; to contemplate a large field of truth in its various component parts; and in other similar exercises which will be suggested by the enumeration of these. Its end, as F. Parkinson observes (p. 31), is "the improvement of the mind itself, so that it may gain power to

master and digest real knowledge, and facility to apply itself to any subject and in any manner that may hereafter be required of it."

Moral and intellectual education not only are separable in idea, but have been constantly and to the widest extent separated in fact. Great numbers of saintly men have been almost entirely destitute of intellectual culture ; a large proportion of intellectual men have been during life bondslaves of the flesh, the world, and the devil, and are probably now enduring those torments which will never end. And so our author reminds us (p. 20), that admirable moral training "may be and has been effected without any intellectual culture at all, in the ordinary sense of the word." We would only pause for one moment, to draw his attention to a somewhat strange mistake into which he has been elsewhere betrayed ; for in p. 22 he counts "enlightening the understanding by sound principles" as a part of *intellectual* education. This statement, however, is plainly a mere accidental inadvertence. It would have been strange, indeed, if a Catholic religious had really meant that Kant and Laplace were more "enlightened by sound principles" than B. Benedict Joseph Labré, and the Curé of Ars ; and we most gladly testify that the whole spirit of his lecture is opposed to so shocking a notion. F. Parkinson, then, fully agrees with ourselves that moral and intellectual education are totally separate things and must be considered separately. And we shall find, on reflection, that in regard to the former there is but one class of questions possible ; while in regard to the latter, there are two classes totally distinct.

No Catholic, indeed no Theist in his senses, can possibly doubt that a thoroughly good moral education is, in every case without exception, one of the greatest blessings that can either be given or received. The only questions which can possibly arise relate to the means of imparting it. It may be doubted, *e. g.*, how far, and to what extent, the agency of punishment should be introduced ; how far the interference of superiors should extend ; how a spirit of devotion may be most effectively infused ; how the mysteries of our Lord may be most deeply impressed on the heart, &c. &c. There are very many questions of this kind, and they are among the most important which can occupy the human intellect ; but they are all, as has been said, of one class. On the other hand, in regard to intellectual education, the relevant questions appertain to two classes so absolutely distinct that nothing but confusion can arise unless they be kept most carefully apart. One class corresponds with those which arise in regard to moral education ; namely, how a solid and effective intellectual education *can best be given*. But there are other questions which demand a prior consideration ; namely, how far, and in what circumstances, a solid and effective intellectual education is *desirable*. And of these latter questions we will first speak.

Great and perplexing as is the difficulty which surrounds many of these questions, there can be no second opinion among Catholics as to the *principle* on which they should be decided. Man is made, as our author most opportunely reminds us (p. 20), not to analyze, or argue, or theorize, but "to know God, and love Him and serve Him in this world, and to be happy with Him for ever in the next." Yet, at the same time, intellectual excellence is an *instrument*, the potency of which is incalculably great ; it

gives to man vast and, in some sense, irresistible power over his fellow men. We can see, then, at once what would be the desirable consummation, if it were only practicable. The desirable consummation would be, that all loyal and true-hearted sons of the Church—all those who love God, and seek to promote His cause—should be possessed of this most serviceable endowment, while His enemies should be utterly stupid and unintellectual. Suppose a formidable tumult is raging in some city, while a quantity of singularly effective weapons is stored in the armoury. There are two most desirable ends at which to aim, and it is difficult to know which is the more desirable of the two. The first is, that these weapons shall be *given* to loyal citizens ; the second, that they shall be *withheld* from rioters and thieves. This is the principle dictated by reason and common sense ; and on this the Church has ever acted. No one can pretend that she has been indifferent to the progress of profound intellectual education among those of her own loyal children who were in circumstances to receive it ; but, true to her sacred instincts, she has ever shown the deepest sense of those disastrous consequences which must result, wherever intellectual activity is divorced from love of God and submission to the Church. Strange that she should have been denounced as the enemy of reason, for pursuing that course which (alone of all others) is conformable to reason.

In the mediæval period there was a certain distant approximation to the desirable result above mentioned ; for the circumstance of intellectual education being almost exclusively in clerical hands, gave a certain not inconsiderable security that it should be duly subordinated to moral and spiritual. At present, however, not only has this state of things ceased, but there seems not the faintest chance of its revival ; and since, therefore, it is hopeless to withhold a most powerful weapon from God's enemies, we should be doubly sedulous in imparting it to His friends. So far, indeed, as education of the leisured classes is concerned, Catholics seem to have arrived pretty generally at the true *theory*, however inadequately that theory may have been reduced to *practice*. It is certainly most important, they feel, to take every possible means that moral education may be supreme over intellectual, and that those serious moral dangers which intellectual education engenders shall be met and counteracted ; otherwise intellectual education will do far more harm than good. But this being presupposed, there can hardly be a more sacred duty—*e.g.*, in England—than that of actively co-operating with our ecclesiastical superiors in any scheme which they may adopt for diffusing the very best attainable intellectual education among our leisured classes. Unless we can be fairly matched with Protestants on the intellectual arena (and at present we are far, indeed, from being so), we shall be unable really to exhibit before their eyes the Church's divine features, and multitudes of erring sheep will miss the true fold.

This conclusion applies to the case of those whose circumstances enable them to receive a thoroughly effective intellectual training, and to do really important intellectual service in the Church's cause. But it is a different question altogether how far it will be beneficial or otherwise, that *others* shall receive the highest intellectual education which their position permits. And,

passing over the numerous intermediate ranks of society between the highest and lowest, let us, in company with F. Parkinson, consider these latter. In regard, then, to those whose whole occupation is to be of a manual and mechanical character, is it advantageous that we should aim in any degree at their intellectual education as such? We are far from wishing to dogmatize on a subject which is confessedly an open question among Catholics; but we entertain, at all events, a very decided opinion that F. Parkinson is thoroughly one-sided in its treatment. He inculcates (p. 11) "the necessity of intellectual culture as a *leading part of our children's education*," and protests (p. 10) against "limiting the pressure of this great duty to any particular class among us; to the rich, for instance, to the exclusion of the poor." The bias of our own opinion, in regard to the poor, inclines in a very opposite direction. We are inclined to think that "a little learning is a dangerous thing": (1) it tends to sully the simplicity of faith, without substituting in its stead anything half so good: and (2) it certainly exposes its recipient to a most serious danger from anti-Catholic propagandism. For such a modicum of cultivation enables a man to understand the obvious objections to Revelation, *c.g.*, such as physical science suggests, and tempts him also to a certain pride in his own cleverness in seeing them; while it is insufficient to give him the faintest notion of that mass of various and mutually strengthening evidences for Catholicism which the pious man, who possesses real intellectual profundity, is able to cultivate and combine. It is very important, indeed, for practical purposes that the children of the poor shall learn reading, writing, and the simplest parts of arithmetic. It is very important for practical purposes that they shall imbibe what has of late been called a knowledge of common things; that they shall be taught the arts (so inestimably valuable for their whole earthly future) of manual industry and skill on the one hand, of cookery, housewifery, and general domestic management on the other. And it is immeasurably more important, because for purposes immeasurably more practical, that the doctrines and practical lessons of our holy religion shall be impressed on their minds with the utmost attainable completeness and vividness. We believe that these things cannot be adequately done if more than these be attempted. Nay, we believe (though this we regard as a matter of far minor importance) that by such a method these children will in fact receive the best *intellectual* education of which they are susceptible.

There remains that class of questions which concerns, not the *desirableness* of intellectual education, but the best means of imparting it where it is desirable. And here we are far more simply in accordance with F. Parkinson's drift and spirit than in the other portions of his lecture. On these questions, not to mention other important treatises, we have had in our own time and country two admirable expositions of theory; the one from a Catholic, the other from a Protestant pen. The first is Father Newman's magnificent course of Dublin lectures; the second, an almost equally admirable essay (which F. Parkinson has quoted in page 32), written by Dr. Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, and published in the "Oxford Essays" for 1855. There is one question, however, which neither of these writers has raised, and which the Protestant indeed could not raise, but to which we earnestly entreat the attention of thoughtful Catholics. In

our present number (p. 470) we have mentioned the indubitable fact that those who receive an effective intellectual education must suffer incalculable spiritual detriment if they be not taught religious doctrine with far greater intellectual accuracy and completeness than is at all necessary, or even possible, for others. We earnestly wish that Catholic thinkers would consider whether such instruction, which is thus indispensable to their moral and spiritual education, may not be made extremely serviceable to their intellectual education also.

The Adventures of Owen Evans, Esq., Surgeon's Mate, left ashore in 1739 on a Desolate Island; narrated by himself. Edited by Rev. W. H. ANDERDON, M.A. Dublin: Fowler. London: Burns & Lambert. 1863.

THERE are not many subjects more fascinating to the youthful imagination than the occupation of a desert island by shipwrecked mariners. It affords the charm, in the first place, of unexpected safety; then of entire novelty. There is great danger and uncertainty; but there is also the unlimited stock of human powers for imagination to draw upon in the struggle. In the construction of such castles in the air, the builders need never calculate the chances of failure, and the only sense of disappointment that can arise is the satiety which comes on when the structure is completed. It is hardly necessary to say that of all such books "Robinson Crusoe" must be the type, as the "Iliad" must be the type of all epics. But there is no reason why the attempt is not to be repeated in different forms, because perfection has already been attained. Several such works have been produced in our language. There are the "Adventures of Captain Seaward," a clever production of Miss Porter's; the "Rival Crusoes," an ingenious tale of less pretensions, where two youths of opposite characters are thrown ashore, one of whom shuns the other from malignant feelings. There is the "Family Robinson," a very genial performance of its class. Mr. Anderdon's book, as a work of art, is equal or superior to any of these, and we cordially welcome it as a most valuable addition to Catholic literature in this important department.

The reader will recollect that in the old "Robinson Crusoe" a Catholic priest makes his appearance towards the end of the tale, and is represented with a degree of fairness highly creditable to Defoe, though his knowledge of the Catholic religion did not enable him to exhibit a priest in such a position acting in really priestly character. He is merely a benevolent teacher, and the ideas which would be foremost in the mind of a Catholic missionary so placed are simply absent from De Foe's picture. This neglected part of the great novelist's fiction seems to have suggested to Mr. Anderdon the idea of Owen Evans's adventures, in which, however, the priest appears from the first. A Spanish ecclesiastic, Don Manuel, with the surgeon's mate and four English sailors, are abandoned on a desert island in the tropics by the piratical crew of the vessel among whom they had unawares trusted themselves. Their firearms, which luckily they had retained, with some powder and shot, secure them from starvation at the beginning, and they soon manu-

facture bows and arrows ; they find bread-fruit and yams ; they make candles of cocoa-nuts ; they excavate a cave into a series of apartments ; they construct a fence formed into a maze. Some Indians are cast ashore in the early days of their story, and, later on, a Spanish vessel is wrecked on the coast ; so that a respectable number of settlers are brought together. The priest acts throughout as the father and guide of the band, over whom he gains ascendancy by his dignity, kindness, and fertility of resource. The story is written in a style imitating the quaint and somewhat drawling manner of "Gulliver" and "Robinson Crusoe ;" and this imitation Mr. Anderdon has managed particularly well. We would only remark that the letter prefixed from an aunt of Owen Evans is much too antiquated for the supposed date. The whole narrative is interwoven with conversations on religion, such as might be expected from a priest thus thrown among Protestants and heathen, and which end in the conversion of all. The anxiety of the priest to be enabled to offer the Holy Sacrifice, and the spiritual mass devised for his converts, are described in a very pleasing manner. The story winds up with the departure of the priest to evangelize the island from whence the Indians had come, his success in which undertaking is related in a memoir supposed to be picked up subsequently at sea. The band of exiles, after their excavations have been overthrown by an eruption, are enabled to escape on board a French vessel which fortunately appears in sight of the island at the very moment it is wanted. It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to criticise the probability of the incidents, since they are managed so as to round off the story agreeably. A great familiarity with nautical phrases and practical matters is shown throughout. The hero of the story is certainly the priest ; the other characters are but slightly drawn. The conversions are the point of leading interest ; but the "Crusoe" incidents, if we may coin a name for them, are so well drawn, that they will make the book a favourite with many a reader who, on first opening it, would be little likely to care much for the theological parts. We have no doubt that it will furnish many an hour of amusement to young readers on board ship or in the settler's hut, and will minister to them many a good and fruitful thought besides.

Glimpses into Petland. By the Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A., F.L.S., &c. London : Bell & Daldy. 1863.

OF all the ways of observing animal life, the most attractive, certainly, is that of which Virgil sets the best example in his bees ; we mean that of viewing the lower creation with reference to their affinities to the higher. And this line of observation is only to be found in minds of great kindliness and powers of attachment. Nowhere does the intellectual stand in greater need of alliance with the moral part of the soul than in the study of natural history. This little book of Mr. Wood's (so well known by several works of original but popular research that may be classed with such books as White's "Selborne") is an excellent illustration of this rule. He has given us sketches of the habits of a number of creatures, some to be found about every fireside, others, pets of a rarer description, tortoises and lizards, as well

as cats and rabbits. The genial and hearty sympathy he shows throughout with these interesting animals has been rewarded by the discovery of many traits which to common observers might seem almost too human to be true. Indeed, Mr. Wood's own character is itself one of the most pleasing, though unconscious, features of the book. It enables one to understand of what sort those forgotten persons must have been who tamed for our use the domestic animals of labour, and shows that this process, so important to the world, might still be indefinitely extended. Instead of which, man has rather allowed it negligently to go back. The ancient Egyptians used the hyæna in the chase, an animal now regarded as untameable; and the art of falconry may be said to have disappeared from Europe for nearly a century and a half. Almost a third of this volume is taken up with notices of the ways of a wonderful cat possessed by the author. The simplicity with which Mr. Wood has put some things on record deserves great credit, considering the ridicule to which it is liable on the part of those to whom "Petland" is not so familiar. This cat, whose name was Pret, has been seen to take away the cat's meat furnished a neighbouring cat, hide it in the coal-cellar, and then take his own dinner to his friend. He could understand if people were talking about him, and if they spoke in a disrespectful manner, up went his tail, and he moved towards the door. If no one opened it, he crept under a chair, and refused to come out. He showed great jealousy of disposition, and when a baby was born, who rivalled him in his mistress's affections, no enticement or constraint could induce him to look at it. If lifted up to the cradle, he struggled to get free, and jumped away with an indignant mew; but, when unobserved, he used to steal stealthily up and indulge his curiosity by a look at his little human rival. The same cat murdered a chameleon from jealousy. On the habits of the latter animal, and its extraordinary mutations of colour, Mr. Wood supplies a great deal of curious information. Its prevailing hue is a sooty black; but it changes to verdigris, striped or spotted yellow, mottled brown, and so on. A singular example of this occurred when it was attacked by a dog. Weak as the chameleon is, it held up its paws in a threatening manner, hissing like a cat, and assuming at the same time brilliant changes of colour. Mr. Wood remarks that "this faculty of simulating a power of injury is widely spread through the animal kingdom." Not only does the angry dove ruffle her feathers, but the ringed snake imitates the action of a viper, and drone flies act exactly as if they had a poisonous sting. It is hardly necessary to advert to the very overpowering questions in metaphysics which the presence of these passions and habits in the brute creation opens out. Mr. Wood seems to incline to the view thrown out on this subject in a famous chapter of Butler's "Analogy;" but, however this may be, those strange resemblances to human reason or passion which they exhibit are not the less full of impressive instruction for the religious student of the natural works of God. Indeed it is a question so interesting in itself, and so closely connected with one of much importance now engaging the attention of the philosophical world, that we hope to return to the subject.

Les Auxiliatrices du Purgatoire. Par le R. P. BLOT, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Paris : Périsse.

THE object of this little book is to give an account of a new religious institute, the very name of which is calculated to appeal to our strongest sympathies and holiest affections. In all ages the Church has been tenderly mindful of the Souls in Purgatory : witness her continual remembrance of them in the Holy Sacrifice, the special feast she has appointed for their commemoration and refreshment, and the copious list of indulgences made applicable in their behalf. The rich endowments founded for perpetual masses for departed relatives and others, or by individuals for their own benefit, but of which the hand of the sacrilegious spoiler has very generally robbed the suffering Church, are at once testimonies of the faith and memorials of the warmth of devotion to the holy souls that animated mediæval Christendom. It was reserved for a later age to give that devotion a peculiar development. Piety towards the souls in Purgatory has assumed what we may be allowed to call a less narrow and self-centering form, and is, moreover, manifesting itself in institutions which offer a surer guarantee of permanence than mere endowments, which tempt the cupidity of the world, ever could afford.

Père Blot considers the foundation of the religious institute in question as peculiarly opportune at the present day, under three aspects :—1. As a living monument and testimony to the doctrine of the Church in the face of heretical denial : a religious truth to which persons devote their whole lives receives in that very circumstance an enduring and palpable confirmation. 2. As a compensation for that forgetfulness of the dead so characteristic of modern times. Our cemeteries, he observes, now removed for sanitary reasons from beneath the holy shadow of the Church, are turned into tasteful gardens, thrown open as a public promenade, and the money formerly expended in suffrages for the dead is lavished on pompous funerals. When the dead are remembered, their memory is too often treasured up by Christian relatives in some mere Pagan fashion. A picture, a lock of hair, a packet of letters,—such are the food and consolation of barren regrets, while prayers, masses, communions, alms, austerities, which might benefit the beloved departed, are little thought of by the bereaved survivors. 3. He sees a peculiar seasonableness in the present institution, from the culpable practice of evoking spirits, and gratifying a profane curiosity by unsanctioned intercourse with the invisible world. Men pretend to call up the dead, for the gratification of the living. There is something most repulsive to a Christian's feelings in the meeting of a circle of men and women, perhaps in some rich and luxurious apartment, for the purpose, as they believe, of summoning the dead, in order either to make display of preternatural powers, or to seek a sign for their own mental comfort, or, at best, to satisfy the craving of mere natural affection. Christian charity does not evoke the dead, it descends amongst them to bear them aid and consolation. These pious "helpers" of the afflicted souls are actuated by no motive of morbid curiosity or selfish affection, but by the most generous and self-sacrificing love.

That which specially distinguishes this institute from other religious communities is the additional vow, taken by its members, of giving all to the souls in purgatory. This vow surpasses the heroic act of bestowing all we have to give upon these suffering souls, inasmuch as such act obliges to no additional good works or voluntary sufferings ; whereas the Auxiliatrices bind themselves by vow to pray, suffer, and do much more than they would otherwise have done, in order to succour these holy souls. They devote themselves to the relief of every bodily suffering, making their charitable offices a means of ministering to spiritual sickness. Their success, so far as we are able to lift the veil which Christian modesty and humility draw over good works, has been wonderful in the conversion of sinners : and even bodily cures in which it is difficult not to recognize the intervention of supernatural power, have not been wanting.

The institute owes its foundation to a young French lady, a pupil of the Nuns of the Sacred Heart, who received a special inspiration during an exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, on the 1st of November, 1853 ; and the Curé of Ars may be regarded as its first director, the future foundress having placed herself in communication with him, from an intimate conviction that God had chosen that holy man to be her light and guide in the work to which she desired to consecrate her life. The Auxiliatrices have affiliated to them a third order of women living in the world. These give their indulgences to the souls in purgatory, engage to live a seriously Christian life, and on every Tuesday devote to the indigent the labour of their hands. They partake, together with their deceased near relatives, in all the prayers, good works, and indulgences of the society. Honorary members assist the association by annual offerings, or forward the common object by relieving the poor, by causing masses to be offered, or, if priests, themselves offering them ; and by other good works for the same intention. They make the acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity every day, with the invocation, " Jesus, mercy," for the suffering souls. Their deceased relatives benefit by all the masses, prayers, and good works of the society, in which they have also themselves an interest during life and after death.

Question des Sœurs de la Charité en Portugal (1857—1862), d'après la Presse et les Documents officiels. Lisbonne : Imp. de la Société Typographique Franco-Portugaise. 1863.

THIS publication has reached us at too late an hour to allow us to do more than direct our readers' attention to the fact of its appearance. It contains a detailed account, supported by official documents, of the infamous manner in which the Sisters of Charity have been treated in Portugal. It is our intention to give a full analysis of the volume in an early number ; meanwhile, we recommend a study of its contents to all who desire to have a clear conception of the aims and tactics of the antichristian revolutionary faction, who are urging the so-called Liberal, but, in fact, impotent, governments of the present day on a course which must be fatal alike to religion, true freedom, and social order.

Foreign Periodical Literature.

Etudes Religieuses, Historiques et Littéraires. Par des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus. Paris : Douniol.

THE May-June number of this periodical contains an article on the Protestants of France. The sceptic, M. Renan, in his published apology for the offensive terms which he had used in his professorial chair at the Collège de France concerning the Person of our Blessed Lord, while recalling the expressions which had excited the strongest disapprobation, observed, "There are pulpits in France where the said words might have been preached." This could be alleged only of the Protestant pulpits, and, unfortunately, there is too much ground for the assertion. Protestantism in France is not now what it was in the days of Claude and Jurieu. There has been a wide departure from the so-called orthodoxy of earlier times ; but it would be a mistake to infer a corresponding diminution of influence and importance. On the contrary, ever since the year 1789, when Louis XVI. signed the edict of toleration, the weight of the Protestant body in the country has been on the increase. They have adroitly profited by each fresh political change to improve their situation ; and since the revolution of 1848, they have set up a claim, not only to complete religious liberty, which the law had secured to them from the period just mentioned, but to an equality "full, perfect, absolute," as one of their publicists (M. de Félice) expresses it ; "so that the constitution would be violated were the Government to accord any pre-eminence whatsoever to the Roman Church," a position which it is maintained by legists of authority cannot be conceded to them, everything having been restored, in 1852, to the same condition as under the first Empire. The great innovation of modern times with respect to the different forms of worship, is the placing the two great Protestant divisions, the Lutherans and the Calvinists, as well as the Jewish body, on a level with the Catholic Church, in this respect, that they are all made to figure in the budget ; an arrangement which dates from the Consulate, and by which their ministers were raised to the rank of public functionaries, and received, like the Catholic clergy, a salary. This general term began at that time to be substituted for that of indemnity, which the Constituent Assembly had adopted, with propriety, in the case of the Church, but which would have been meaningless as applied to the sects.

It must be remembered that the rigorous measures adopted against Protestants in France by Louis XIV. (which the reviewers do not undertake to justify) applied to the Calvinists alone ; and that these measures had much more of a political than a religious object, we are led to infer from the fact that the Lutherans, who chiefly occupy Alsace, and to whom freedom of conscience was guaranteed by the terms of the union of that province with

France, remained exempt from all molestation. Not only was faith strictly kept with them, but even the Calvinists settled amongst them were admitted to the enjoyment of the same privileges. The Lutherans of these Rhenish provinces were a laborious and a peaceful population, offering a remarkable contrast to the fiery, turbulent, and fanatical Protestants of the Reform, a character of which the Revolution found them still in possession. Both bodies were recognized by the Government in the "Organic Articles." These articles, as is well known, were not approved by the Holy See, and consequently were never recognized by the Church as any part of the Concordat. But with the Protestants the case was different; having no spiritual head, they could not aspire to a concordat, and the Organic Articles were so far a boon. A civil constitution was all which they were capable of receiving: it was given to them. We hear very little of these religionists during the Empire, the Restoration, or the Government of July. By their own confession, this was owing, not to want of liberty, but to the absence of interior life. No religious writer of any eminence appeared amongst them; on the other hand, the rationalistic theories of Germany had not at that time engaged much of their attention. It forms, perhaps, the quietest period of their history. How are we to account, asks the reviewer, for their dissatisfaction with a constitution which contented them for half a century? The law of the 18 Germinal, above alluded to, has been greatly extended in their favour since 1852, yet we still find them active in pushing forward their interests. To what are we to attribute this sudden revival of Protestantism from its torpor? Our reviewers consider it as the result of the recent social commotions. Between "Reform" and revolution there were always close affinities. The first revolution increased the importance of the Protestant body, and revealed its sympathies; in 1848 we find its hopes again excited.

The number of the Calvinists and Lutherans of France would, certainly, not appear to be formidable: it is difficult to fix it with any accuracy, but it probably exceeds a million. Anyhow, they form an insignificant minority of the population. Not so, however, when we view their place in literature and the press, and in the liberal professions and government offices. Above all, their periodical literature is worthy of note. It occupies a large field, thanks to its alliance with those writers of anti-Christian tendencies, who in Catholic countries are always to be found in combination with Protestants. Together they form a kind of vanguard to infidelity. At the present day we may reckon up twenty-four so-called religious magazines, addressed to all ages and classes, in which nothing is overlooked which may seduce into error a public ill-instructed in matters of faith. In the political press, few think of inquiring or caring of what religion a publicist may be. *Le Temps* is wholly Protestant; it is none the less read. Its Protestantism, moreover is very advanced; in other words, it is pure rationalism, making common cause with everything bearing the name of Protestantism, in order to attack Catholicism. Then there is the *Revue Germanique*, a kindred production. The Protestants have also the *Revue Nationale*, a kind of fusion of free-thinking spiritualism and independent Protestantism. The *Revue des Deux Mondes* and the *Journal des Débats* must, in all fairness, be added to the number, and considered, practically, as organs of Protestantism; for when

do they fail to espouse the interests of the "Reform" and its supporters against the Church? although writers like M. Rémusat, who are completely identified with Protestant ideas, will now and then startle us by using the expression *we* in speaking of Catholics. If this is the state of the moderate and conservative press, what must be thought of the democratic? Viewing the imposing forces of combined Radicalism, Rationalism, and Protestantism, and comparing them with our own slender resources, men might tremble for France were it not for the knowledge that God watches over His people.

The Protestants have three great schools for the training of their ministers,—Montauban, Strasbourg, and Geneva. That of Geneva is altogether Socinian, and the "orthodox," such as M. Guizot, for instance, bitterly regret the numbers of French ministers educated there since the time when, by an agreement with the Government, the studies were assimilated with those of the two other schools. At Strasbourg, Lutheranism is nominally taught; but a chair has been erected for the Calvinists,—a superfluous accommodation, it may be observed, in the present state of things, when the decline of religious belief has left little beyond administrative differences between the two confessions. German Rationalism is prevalent in the Strasbourg school. It is quite as eminent as that of Montauban, which is Calvinist, and maintains the highest character for "orthodoxy," although not a few rationalistic professors have issued even from this quarter. It has 74 students, while Geneva and Strasbourg united number 123.

We must not overlook the addition to the number and influence of the two bodies receiving State salary, from the unrecognized sects, which have been gradually formed through that tendency to indefinite subdivision common to Protestantism in all its varieties. Some of these are of native growth, others have been imported from foreign countries; but, however differing amongst each other, they are all one in their hostility to the Church. Protestantism therefore cannot be said to be dead in France; rather it may be described as undergoing a process of transformation, by which its dangerous character is greatly increased. It is no slight matter to have to deal with Protestants thus transformed. Is there any essential difference between them and Revolutionists?

Le Correspondant. Paris: Douniol.

AN article in the July number of the *Correspondant*, on the poet Giacomo Leopardi, a name, as the writer observes, not popular in Italy and little known in France—we might add, or in England—contains a curious description of his peculiar form of melancholy, the special growth of a period from which we are now emerging, but of which many amongst us have personal recollection. A younger generation have inherited its poetic lucubrations, in which an unhealthy sadness has received the apotheosis of genius. The literature which was the offspring of this spirit and which marked the beginning of the century, is happily calculated neither for a durable nor for a very extensive popularity. It had, however, in our own country at least, great temporary influence over a large and important class,—the educated rising generation; and it will always attract a certain select

number of minds whose fine and delicate, or ardent and impassioned, constitution tends to the morbid or the exaggerated, owing to a defect in the regulating power of moral and religious principle. But the poetry of negation and despair can never take firm hold of the admiration of humanity; and it is not of a character likely to obtain from posterity the reparation of a tardy applause.

Our reviewer remarks that a period of scepticism and discouragement commonly precedes one of declension. So it was under the brilliant reign of the first Roman emperor; the greatest geniuses were affected by the heavy weight in the moral atmosphere, although the melancholy of antiquity differs widely in its characteristics from the far deeper sadness of modern times. This was to be expected, and has been the result of Christianity which, by raising the aspirations of men to higher objects and throwing a light upon the vanity of all earthly things, has excited and developed longings and revealed truths which are neither repressed nor obliterated in minds where the light of faith has been extinguished, nor altogether absent or undiscerned where it has never shone.

The dogmatizing materialism of the 18th century struck at the dearest hopes of humanity, and men threw themselves for a brief space into the illusive hopes of an earthly felicity. It was the day of political, social, and philosophical Utopias. Human society was seized with an immense enthusiasm, which constitutes, perhaps, the imposing side of '89. The awakening followed; and the powerlessness of this sweeping revolution to heal the perennial sorrows of mankind only revealed more fully the depth of the wound. A bitter sense of discouragement succeeded this discovery; our century was ushered in amidst blood and tears; and sorrow, as a woman of genius has said, became the inspirer of talent. The Italian materialists had not gone the length of the French Encyclopédists; they could never bring themselves to ignore the existence of higher aspirations—they stopped short at the desolating conviction that these aspirations had no corresponding object. "Illusions are the only happiness of life," writes Melchior Gioia; "we must strive to multiply their number." But his was an essentially superficial character, and this miserable conviction does not seem to have troubled his rest. Foscolo was a sceptic of a higher order of mind, and betrays a consciousness in his writings of the depth of the wound which the 18th century had inflicted on the heart of humanity; but he was so much mixed up with the turmoil of events, and so effectually diverted from following out any deep thoughts or developing them into a system, by those ardent passions which played so large a part also in Byron's career, that the bitter reflections from which Gioia's shallowness altogether exempted him, did little more than pass over the surface of Foscolo's mind.

This new form of scepticism was brought to a focus in Leopardi, and with him it became a prevailing pre-occupation. It is a wretched sight to behold a highly gifted, delicately pure, and exquisitely sensitive mind, once imbued with the true faith, sink into the dark gulf of despairing unbelief; and we agree with our reviewer that there is a class of sceptics whose case makes a strong appeal to our compassion. Their state of mind so closely resembles malady, and bears so unmistakably the stamp of suffering, that pity softens

our censure ; but it is surely too much to say of any man, especially of one brought up in strict religious principles, in the bosom of a Catholic family, that he was "*almost fatally impelled*" towards that bitter doubt which was to absorb all his powers, or to call him the "innocent victim" of an age of infidelity. In 1817, we find his Christian faith not as yet extinct. He was then nineteen. What fatality (if the word could ever be applicable, even with its reservation of "almost," in such a question) could have impelled—what corrupting influence could have had the power to pervert—a mind already formed, without some deflection of the will, however occult, from the right path ? The decline of faith accompanied that of health ; and perhaps he himself furnishes some clue to the double loss, in his own confession to a friend at eighteen, that he had ruined his health "by his mad and greedy pursuit of study." His isolation and solitary life, to one whose mind preyed upon itself, was, perhaps, as injurious as the communications and intercourse with free-thinkers, to which literary life in those times must have led.

Disenchantment as to all human things is the prevailing theme of all his writings. His "*Moral Studies*," chiefly thrown into the form of dialogues of the character of Lucian's, but affecting a Greek model, and his "*Odes*," are his principal works. They are characterized by that magnification of inanimate nature at the expense of humanity, which is symptomatic of a divorce of the mind from religious influences, as was indicated in an article from the pen of Victor de Laprade in a former number of this Review, where the prevalence of landscape painting, resembling nature in its merely suggestive character, and the position which music has assumed in the modern field of art, are noticed in connection with the progress of naturalism.

The idea to which Leopardi most constantly recurs is the littleness of man confronted with the immensity of creation, and the small space which the discoveries of modern science leave to him in the universe. Yet he has himself refuted this view where he says, "Ennui is in some sort the most sublime of sentiments," and goes on to show that nothing more strongly proves the greatness and nobility of human nature than its incapability of being satisfied, not only with all that the world contains, but with all that countless imagined worlds might possibly contain.

But it is in his Odes that the torturing contradiction, of which he was the lingering victim, between the longings of his heart and the unbelief of his intellect, displays itself in all its intensity. Imagine, says our Reviewer, the author of the "*Imitation*" losing, if that were possible, his faith, and remaining without stay and without hope ; but with the full perception of the vanity of all things ; add to this, overwhelming bodily sufferings, and you have Leopardi. But he sang on, and such is the spirit of his song. He has lost his God, and he is inconsolable. We find him in his desolation even wishing "that in heaven, or on earth, or in the seas, there were a heart, I will not say to compassionate, but at least to witness our woes."

Leopardi often complains of the little sympathy he receives from his fellow-countrymen : perhaps his morbid pensiveness would have found a more responsive echo in the land of deeper shadows, and amid the mists of our northern climes. But men of his character always believe themselves to be

little understood, and to meet with scarce sympathy from their fellow-men. It is one of their condemning notes. There can be no surer mark of the real corruption before God of a heart, however apparently pure in the eyes of men, than the loss of that geniality of soul of which the highest sanctity, infinitely as it exalts a man above his brethren, never divests him.

We have also an excellent article, in the same number of the *Correspondant*, from the able pen of Victor de Laprade, of the Académie, on recent Historians of the Roman Empire. Under the monarchy of July, historical studies were attracted to the political revolutions of England; now, for obvious reasons, they gravitate towards Imperial Rome. Paradox has succeeded to investigation; and certain pens have undertaken the ungrateful task of rehabilitating a race of despots of whom Tiberius and Nero are the most notable specimens. Posterity is not likely to indorse an opinion which runs counter to a judgment pronounced by the conscience of seventeen centuries. True history, however, pursues its course in the midst of these extravagances, destined but to an ephemeral existence, and the Roman Empire has found an impartial judge in M. Laurentie, who has written in the true spirit of a Christian philosopher. His Introduction is commended as in itself forming a work of considerable importance. Another work of much less recent date, but as yet only published in fragments, is also highly commended, entitled, "Formule générale de l'Histoire appliquée à l'Histoire du Peuple Romain," by M. Ballanche. The reviewer, drawing apparently the staple of his remarks from both these works, but chiefly from M. Laurentie's recently published history, unfolds the true causes of the dominion of Rome, and states the radical difference existing between Cæsarism and the old monarchy which was expelled with the Tarquins. This last is naturally a favourite topic with the friends of true freedom in France, foremost amongst whom rank our Catholic brethren of the *Correspondant*; but it is a subject of hardly less vital interest, if not of such actual moment, in other countries. The principle which Cæsarism embodies is everywhere struggling for ascendancy with more or less prospect of success. Cæsarism, in fact, is but the ultimate realization of the democratic theory of the sovereignty of the people. Historically, it has ever been the climax of democracy, as philosophically it is its exponent. The Roman emperor was "an incarnation of the people-god." The Cæsar, whether of ancient or of modern times, is presumed to be the choice and the permanent expression of the popular will. His power is necessarily arbitrary. Hence also, although accidentally inherited, the dignity has never arrived at being, strictly speaking, hereditary. A people-god may abdicate for a brief period the exercise of its sovereignty in favour of a prince whom it divinizes; but it must gratify itself occasionally by manifesting its power in a fresh incarnation, or by asserting it in the explosion of a revolt. Direct and assured hereditary succession contains a guarantee of stability and moderation which the Roman empire always lacked, in consequence of its democratic origin. The old monarchy of Rome was likewise deficient in this respect; but not from the same cause. The constitution of ancient Rome was based on the patrician order, the hereditary aristocracy, who also, as a body, had sole possession of all sacerdotal offices. The true revolution of

Rome, therefore, did not consist in the expulsion of the Tarquins, nor in the installation of the Casars. It was gradually accomplished in the days of the Republic, and consisted in the transference, step by step, of the power of the patrician order to the people. The kings chosen by the senate had been but heads of a republic; they represented the calm and august domination of that body. The emperors represented the disorderly force of democracy. "No religious right, no political privilege, limited their power over the levelled multitude—nothing save the caprice of that same multitude; nothing, in short, tempered their despotism but the right of anarchy and of assassination." The idea that arose among modern nations of a divine right in the person of the monarch, and of an unlimited power annihilating all individual rights, is a tradition of the old Roman empire, which insinuated itself at the period of the *Renaissance*; and the result has been to compromise hereditary royalty in the eyes of the friends of liberty. These doctrines, which have met with stout resistance from the races and institutions of Germanic origin, have had for their chief supporters the jurists imbued with Roman reminiscences, and the old instincts of the Latin races so long subjected to Roman rule.

The recent apologists of the era of the Casars have hit upon an argument which has found favour with the democrats. They maintain that the cruelty and oppression of the Roman emperors weighed upon the patrician class alone. Waiving altogether the question whether such a fact could be pleaded in extenuation of their guilt, the assertion is manifestly untrue. The tens of thousands who were yearly sacrificed in the sanguinary games of the amphitheatre for the amusement of the divinized people and their representative god, were all drawn from the lower classes. The emperors, it is true, are not chargeable with the initiation of this atrocity, the product of the hard, ferocious spirit of the Latin people, when no longer kept in bounds, as in the earlier days of the Republic, by the civic, domestic, and religious virtues. Nevertheless, they cultivated and increased the taste for blood in the Roman people. Some persons reserve all their anathemas for Greece, which is honourably distinguished among pagan nations as the institutrix of political liberty, and the mother of poetry and of the arts; while Rome, which ruled by material force, receives all their indulgent sympathy. It is not Greece, but Rome, which was drunk with the blood of saints and martyrs, and revelled in the brutal delight of wholesale massacre. The Athenians, be it recorded to their honour, conquered and degenerate as they were, obstinately refused to admit the gladiatorial exhibitions; they succeeded in excluding them from Greece. It must be added that, notwithstanding all the abominations of their mythology, and that corruption of morals which invariably accompanies an impure worship, it would be difficult, even in the decadence of Greece, to find anything to bear a comparison with the depth of Roman depravity, or the monstrosities of Roman orgies in the palmy days of imperial sovereignty.

Rome had military talent, the genius of government and of jurisprudence; but in the latter science we must never forget that Greece preceded her, and that from Greece she borrowed the elements of that civil law in which she gloried. In arts, in philosophy, in religion, in poetry, her ideas were totally wanting in fecundity; in all these she was the disciple of her gifted prede-

cessor ; but the genius of domination was her own exclusive and pre-eminent attribute. Other empires have had the power of conquest ; she alone possessed the art of subjugation ; and such is the idolatrous worship paid by the multitude to force, the very force which lays its iron hand upon them, that the memory and imagination of people are still fascinated by that art of tyranny of which Rome was the consummate mistress. To this tendency of minds, especially at the present time, we must refer the modern attempts to rehabilitate the characters of the democratic tyrants of Rome. Such a history as that of M. Laurentie's renders, therefore, essential service both to historical truth and to the best interests of humanity.

The paper entitled "Avant et pendant la Terreur" is very interesting ; but we have no space for more than a cursory notice. A review of M. Mortimer Ternaux's valuable history of the Terror is the occasion of most of the observations it contains. The "fanatics of the Revolution" have taken upon themselves to whitewash, to the best of their ability, the heroes of the Terror, alleging now the purity of their intentions and their irreproachable character, now the faults of subalterns who exceeded their instructions. When these arguments, helped out by judicious omissions and picturesque groupings, are too manifestly inadequate for their purpose, they fall back on the inherent force of things, the necessity of overcoming resistance, and all those excuses which would avail to justify every crime, including highway robbery and murder. Misrepresented facts and unwholesome theories thus go hand in hand. The best remedy against these errors is to be sought in the conscientious study of events by the help of the undeniable evidence of genuine documents. A portion only of M. Mortimer Ternaux's history has been published ; but it gives ample promises of fulfilling this condition. It is well to bear in mind, however, that most of the great Terrorists do not appear to have been born worse men than many so-called good sort of people whom we elbow every day in common life. Though less dangerous, it is not more exact, to make a sort of infernal demigods of them, than to see in them the liberators of humanity. If we look at these monster men before they became infuriated by that "drunkenness of crime" which we so often witness in times of maddening excitement, or even after the paroxysm has subsided, we shall be perfectly astonished at their similarity to ordinary mortals. "We must not imagine that the exceptional crimes committed during the Revolution were committed by exceptional beings ; but we may be thoroughly persuaded that we have near and around us numbers of persons capable at any given moment of re-enacting the days of September and of the Revolutionary Tribunal. Dii avertite omen !"

La Civiltà Cattolica. Roma.

THE *Civiltà Cattolica* usually contains, besides the "Review of the Press," which consists of what we should technically call "Short Notices," though occasionally running to some length, and the "Current Events—Cronica Contemporanea"—three or four original articles. Many of them form parts of

a succession of papers, extending, when completed, to the size of a volume. Amongst these we have perused with interest a series of essays on the subject of social beneficence, in which are discussed its connection with religion, the province of the Church in the administration of charitable funds, and the proper share which government may and ought to take in the promotion, and, in a limited degree, the regulation of public charities. The last two papers (for the subject was brought to a close in the number for July 4th) treat of an important topic—the intrusion of governmental influence into this department. There is no country in which this intrusion is not more or less to be apprehended; the disposition to meddle may be presumed to be never altogether absent; and as all the material power is in the hands of the temporal ruler, it ought to be clear to the unprejudiced upon which side aggression is the most probable. And, in fact, we cannot read the history of any people or government whatsoever, without meeting with the spoliation of monasteries and convents, the suppression of religious confraternities, the banishment or dispossession of the administrators of sacred trusts, and the intrusion of civil officers into works of charity. The evil inflicted by bureaucratic centralization, which our reviewers call that “beast without a heart, and without common sense,” is nothing new. The monopoly of beneficence by the State, to the prejudice of the Church, with all the tyranny, robbery, and injustice of which it has been the pretext and the means, has been a weapon in the hand of political despotism ever since the rise of Protestantism. It can be wielded by a monarch, or a parliament, or by a revolutionary assembly; but under whatever name it is employed, it is always as the instrument of the tyranny of material force over right.

This monopoly is described under five heads:—1. As sacrilegious injustice, being an infringement of the rights of a divine society; 2, as an arbitrary invasion of private property, and an infringement of just liberty; 3, an impious cruelty, depriving the poor of the sweetest balm of their afflictions, and the most powerful incentive to the religious feelings; 4, as an anti-social schism, separating rich and poor, sowing hatred in the bosom of the indigent, and fostering careless indifference in the heart of the wealthy; 5, as a stupid waste of resources, by which the productive principle of beneficent funds is extinguished, by which the State is compelled to charge the public treasury with expenses from which it would have been free, and by which charity is converted into a legal debt. Under all these heads we have excellent observations. None of the reasons urged would possibly stand so good a chance of coming home at last to the apprehension, if not to the conscience of rulers, as those included under the last two heads, were it not for the deeply-rooted prejudice of the world, manifesting itself in the secular policy of governments against the Church. It is patent to all that the festering wound of modern society is the irritation of the poor against the rich—one of the terrible effects of the devouring pauperism of the lowest classes, as contrasted with the increasing ease and luxury of the highest grades of society.

To meet this growing evil, economists have no better remedy than to satisfy the clamorous desires of the poor by a proportionate improvement in their material condition. With them the “social question” is simply a question of production. “Charity,” observes a modern French economist,

"does not add to the national wealth, it merely displaces it ; but an increase of production swells the available fund—there is solidarity between capital and labour." Theorists of this class fail to answer two important questions : Will the comfort of the poor keep pace with increased production ? Do the easy classes always expend their additional capital in salaries to the working classes ? How much goes in articles of luxury and display ? How much is accumulated for the advantage of their families ? Granting, however, that increased production benefits the working classes, what is to be done when the population has received an increase proportionate to its prosperity ? The difficulty returns. These economists entirely overlook what is, nevertheless, the most important part of the question ; they treat it as a matter of a little more or a little less of material wealth ; they take no account of its moral bearing. Now the great evil of pauperism is to be sought less in its actual privations than in the sentiments and feelings of those who are subjected to them. A French writer has gone so far as to deny the increase of pauperism (an assertion, however, which we join our reviewers in questioning), but he is certainly right in regarding its actual dangers as springing less from its amount than from its modern accompaniments. On the one hand, the galling contrast which the luxury of our times presents to the poverty which it confronts, and, on the other, the uneasy state of the masses, to whom their rights have been preached, if their necessities have not been supplied, and who have become impatient of sufferings and social inferiority which were formerly accepted as necessary and irremediable evils. Now, if it be true, as it certainly is to a notable degree, that the sense of unjust inferiority constitutes the social danger of pauperism, what possible remedy can be found except in religious influences, which shall at once soften the bitter feelings of the poor, and open the hand and heart of the rich ? Catholic charity reconciles the bondsmen of toil with the children of affluence : here is the great specific for our social grievances and dangers. The Church—and by the Church is to be understood the whole mystical body of the faithful, informed by the spirit of fraternal love—organizes countless associations of charity to extend the hand of beneficence and compassion to every sorrow and every suffering, accompanied by what is sweeter still, the balm of sympathy. "This meeting of the two classes, the highest and the lowest, in the kiss of peace ; this intimate knowledge which the poor thus acquire of the charity of the rich, and the rich of the wants of the poor, naturally produces an entire transformation of heart in both." The rich man finds that there are better pleasures than luxurious boards, splendid equipages, dances, and theatres ; and the poor man, who sees grandeur changed into loving compassion, and wealth liberally expended in the relief of his necessities, has no longer the heart to envy the rich man who is become his friend and benefactor. The revolutionary spirit of the day would break this Christian bond between rich and poor ; and one of its most astute arts consists in robbing the Church of her means of charity, and of her liberty of association ; thus endeavouring to create or widen the gulf between the classes, so that the rich may forget themselves in egotistical enjoyment, and the poor, reduced to the extreme of destitution and degradation, may be easily persuaded that those riches of which not even the superfluity is showered upon their misery, is a robbery,

and that to their own strong arms can they alone look for the restoration of a just equality. The sect which has conspired against all order, precipitates the governments they desire to overthrow upon this suicidal course. The marvel is, that rulers not only should be ready to follow the fraudulent advice, but should be themselves the first to rush upon their ruin, so blinding is the ambition of sovereignty, and that intolerance of resistance which accompanies it.

The waste of means ensuing from government taking the administration of charity into its hands is also clearly exposed. We must content ourselves with little more than specifying the chief points. First, we have the uneconomical results of this intrusion in the diminution of the funds themselves from which public charity is to be administered. These will soon cease to be fed by voluntary contributions. Liberality will always be proportioned to the confidence felt in the hands which receive the deposit. Can it be expected that Catholics will place the same reliance upon government and its subordinates as upon the Church and her ministers? Secondly, instead of gratuitous administrators, we have now a host of officials who must be paid. Their salaries, consequently, have to be deducted from the funds, not to speak of the possibility, or rather probability, of malversation. Without supposing this generally to equal the almost incredible amount stated in the *Armonia* of Turin, where twelve millions of ecclesiastical money appropriated by the State to public charities are shown to have yielded only three for the benefit of the poor, it must be taken into some account. Then we have, thirdly, the loss to the really indigent from the grievance of partiality. For how are the funds distributed? It is notorious how large an amount was recently applied in the kingdom of Naples to the reward of certain "patriots," so-called, and went to enrich the Garibaldians. Without supposing again that favouritism always assumes such appalling proportions, it is an almost necessary accompaniment, in some measure, of a system in which the want which claims relief is far removed from the central administration which supplies it. But, after all deductions, we come, fourthly, to the mode of relief: we here meet with the cold legal formalities attesting the claims of the petitioners, upon the satisfactory fulfilment of which they become entitled to certain fixed sums. So far as it goes, this subsidy, being assured, enters into the calculations of the poor, and thus becomes an incentive to idleness. Moreover, the government, having to meet want with inadequate means, is compelled to have recourse to a public tax, a new financial burden. Yet, after every resource has been adopted, what comparison does the money thus compulsorily raised bear to what Christian charity used spontaneously to pour into the Church's lap? But the poor must be fed; and to meet the claims of legal charity, with even the most pitiful sufficiency, there are but two courses,—to increase the funds, or to discourage the petitioners. To render the multitude less importunate, it must be made irksome and humiliating to ask alms. Where relief is public, the bashful poor will shrink from asking. Thus legal charity is constrained to proceed on diametrically opposite principles to those of Christian almsgiving: it mixes gall with the bread of the miserable; how else should there be enough for all? Then the government is compelled to set its paupers to some kind of work in order to reimburse

itself, in a measure, for what it has expended upon them. This unpaid work, whether compulsory or not, enters into competition with that of the able-bodied and industrious labourers, and is thus a further miscalculation in an economical point of view.

Living in an age when politicians profess to make the increased comfort and liberty of the lower classes their special object, it is perfectly marvellous to see legislators so infatuated as to chain up the freedom of Catholic charity, which would spontaneously provide for all the wants of the poor, and prefer burdening both sick and poor with vexatious expedients for the ill performance of the office it has usurped. It would, indeed, be unintelligible if the oppression of the Church were not closely connected with the suppression of Catholic charity.

It may be well to observe that, in a previous paper, the duty of the government to intervene in cases where private charity is insufficient to meet the necessities of the poor is recognized, and the laws which ought to govern its proceedings are examined. The writers consider that a good government can never be reduced to the necessity of imposing a general tax for the relief of the poor. It is its duty to ascertain upon what portion of the community the obligation devolves, and to take measures, founded upon the laws of Christian justice and the order of charity, for the relief of the sufferers. The Christian rule of proximity, which may be either physical or moral—the latter being of the more stringent obligation—must guide its conduct. We quote one sentence from the section upon the obligation of municipalities:—"If this preference exists (a preference founded on the duty of love to our neighbour), if it constitutes amongst families thus associated a special duty, government, which is bound to enforce the fulfilment of all external duties belonging to public order, has the right to require that the families of a commune (parish) should contribute specially to the support of their poor." In so doing, the government is not unjustly interfering, but only enforcing a law founded on nature and incorporated into the earliest laws of Christian society.

The writers, therefore, fully grant, and indeed maintain, that the State is bound to save all its citizens from dying of want. What they say is—first, that when government cripples the Church's means of relieving the poor, and takes the administration of charity out of her hands, by prohibiting her associations, as of late in France, or by hindering her from receiving the bequests of the faithful, and thus makes charity an affair of government, instead of considering its office as supplemental, it is the cause of great evil, because it acts directly as an impediment to things being done in a much higher way. Secondly, that where the government's interference becomes necessary, it is bound to make a just repartition of the burdens, so that the charge shall fall as much as possible upon those upon whom it devolves as a moral duty. They never say that, if the necessity cannot thus be met, the tax must not be extended.

Two papers have appeared, in the numbers for August 1st and 15th, on Modern and Ancient Civilization, a subject peculiarly suited to the pages of a Review bearing the name of the *Civiltà Cattolica*. Time was when, in the

Catholic world at least, the Church was recognized, not only as the foundress, but as the great teacher of civilization, in the sense in which the word was understood in the European commonwealth even a century and a half ago. But how stands the question in this year of grace 1863? The enemies of the Church, of course, will not concede her that title. If she ever had any true understanding of the subject, she has certainly none now-a-days, or, at any rate, the world has run far ahead of her. But what answer will her friends give to the question, Is the Church the leader of modern civilization? They can hardly reply with an unqualified affirmative. But how is this? The Church cannot change; if, then, in former times the very notion of civilization was inseparably associated with the Church, and if now, on the contrary, so far from leading the van, she holds back, nay looks with a suspicious not to say condemning eye upon much that enters into the idea of modern "progress," we are led to the inevitable conclusion that it is the word civilization that has changed its signification. Men have certainly come to understand something very different by the word from what our forefathers, in unison with the Church, understood by it; and, because she abides by her old idea, and false friends and enemies alike see no hope of moving her, it is agreed to sequester her from all participation in secular affairs, for which she has no competence.

We see here the origin and pretext of the unjust aggression on the territory and rights of the Holy See. It was unfair, men said, that any people should be deprived of all the splendid advantages of modern civilization, segregated from the fellowship of civilized nations, and thus condemned to hopeless stagnation under the rule of priests. Get rid of pontiff-kings: this is the only way to effect the liberation of the people.

But what is civilization? We have only to refer to the etymology of the word in order to ascertain its meaning; for it is derived from the Latin word *civis*, which is itself derived from the verb *cœo*, to consort together. Plainly, therefore, civilization is a participation in those qualities and advantages which fit man to live in society. So essential to the establishment of the Church among any people is it that they should possess at least the rudiments of social life, that, where she does not find them, as among savages, she proceeds at once to create them. The work of the Jesuits in Paraguay will at once suggest itself as a case in point.

But further, the idea of civilization includes, not only what is essential to the social state, but all that tends to humanize, refine, and elevate mankind. And it needs but a moment's reflection as to the Church's intimate connection with all man's social relations, to perceive how powerful must be her action even in the natural order, although the supernatural, not the natural, is her own immediate province. For, as grace presupposes nature and builds upon it, so the Church, which is a perfect and supernatural society, makes natural society the subject and basis of her supernatural action. Therefore, the more perfect that natural society is, in every respect, the fuller and the more efficacious will be the supernatural action of the Church; the converse also being true, that in proportion to the full and efficacious action of the Church will be the perfection of civil society.

Now, the Church possesses in her own organism every quality necessary to

the perfecting of society, and she has them pure from any adverse mixture. The civil and domestic virtues have their foundation in the recognition of duties and in the binding authority of conscience. Who but the Church can teach and enforce them? To the Church also society owes the principle which asserts the pre-eminence of right over might, the sole possible guarantee for personal and political freedom. This principle was unknown in ancient society, which derived law now from the will of Cæsars, now from that of the multitude, or, rather, from the majority of a limited class; the great bulk of the population being reduced to slavery and grovelling in the deepest degradation. Authority was the tyranny of force; the Church derives it from the Omnipotent God, the Fountain of order and justice. The humanizing effect of the recognition of such principles, however widely men may depart from them in practice, would be obvious, had we not the still more convincing proof afforded by experience. Resting on the sound basis of authority, which is the condition of unity, society was further consolidated and enriched with all the salutary influences which flow from those speculative and practical truths of which the Church is the depository, and which, although they chiefly regard the supernatural order, react beneficially on the truths of the natural order, and on the natural intelligence of man, enlightening and directing it. Thus was Christian science, so far as it is an elaboration of human intellect, built up; and although of the few only could it be the patrimony, it was impossible but that the masses should profit in a measure by the presence of so bright a light in the midst of them; whilst the religious instruction which was supplied to all, placed the most ignorant in a position, even in an intellectual point of view, which might have excited the envy of the wisest of ancient philosophers. To all this must be added the inappreciable influence of Catholic worship in refining and purifying imagination and taste, which, moreover, by its employment of all the imitative and decorative arts, cultivates and exalts the sense of the beautiful, so powerful an engine of true civilization.

Civilization, then, is the natural and spontaneous product of the Church, and of the Church alone. Civilized nations and Christian nations are equivalent terms. Some "Britannic minister," say our writers, "will occasionally hold forth on the barbarism of the Pontifical States and the civil progress of the Grand Turk;" but, speaking generally, we may affirm that no sensible or unprejudiced person will assert that there is anything deserving the name of genuine civilization external to Christianity, or deny its possession, in a higher or lower degree, by all Christian nations. Our writers say *Christian*, not *Catholic*, advisedly; for the nations which have fallen into schism and heresy have not lost by their unhappy separation the heritage of many fruitful truths and principles which have taken root in the common mind, and many acquired habits which have passed into common life. Much has been said, it is true, of ancient Pagan civilization, and even of that of modern Pagan nations—of India and China, for instance; but whatever may have been the proficiency of any of these different nations, be they ancient or modern, in certain arts of civilization, whether in letters, poetry, painting, or mechanical invention and skill, or in all that can minister to the ease and luxury of external life, they are one and all marked by some great perversion

lying at the root of their religious, social, or domestic institutions, and entirely opposed to the perfection of the civil state. We need scarcely give instances of the radical barbarism of these so-called civilized nations. Our readers will at once recall their abominable religious rites, their bloody human sacrifices, the wholesale massacres which formed the favourite diversion of one of the most polished nations of antiquity; they will remember the unnatural exposure or sale of infants by their parents, the offering up of widows or of slaves on the tombs of husbands or masters. Where shall we find the Christian nation in which such abominations have passed into social customs; for it is not here a question of individual crime, but of recognized institutions, the atrocity of which was not, and is not, so much as suspected by the people amongst whom we find them established. From all this we deduce that the true idea of civilization is essentially Christian in its origin.

In defining the civilization which the Church requires as an essential condition to her action, and perfects when created, we have not adverted to that which forms the great boast of our modern times, giving them an incalculable superiority, as men flatter themselves, over all which have preceded. We mean, of course, that whole apparatus of wonderful inventions and discoveries, directed chiefly to an increase of material enjoyment, of riches, luxury, and comfort, such as our fathers never imagined. But—may we not add!—neither would they ever have conceived that such things formed any integral part of the civilization of a Christian people. Our writers have not spoken of these any more than of all the new-born political and social theories, so full of promise of future liberty and happiness, so little successful as yet in securing these blessings to humanity, because they would certainly not have been included in the idea of civilization as our ancestors understood it. Not but that there is a sense in which material comforts and political liberties result from Christian civilization; but as they were never the direct aim of the Church, still less were they ever sought by her without limit or restriction. They flowed as natural consequences from blessings of a higher order, and this very circumstance confined them within their proper bounds, obviating the dangers which arise when they are viewed as absolute goods in themselves, a perversion which makes them degenerate into means of corruption, and consequently sources of barbarism. Some zealous apologists of the Church appear to have overlooked this substitution of a new idea in the minds of her enemies, and not giving sufficient heed to the character of these goods, whether material or political, have been led to undertake an arduous, not to say an impossible task; viz., to prove that the Church has been, and is, the active promoter and favourer of everything that conduces to the convenience and material gratification of men. This is, we entirely agree with our writers, a very great mistake, and one which, like all exaggerations and untruths, is calculated to injure the very cause it aims at defending.

We reserve to our next number a notice of the second paper, which is devoted to a fuller consideration of this particular point, and shows why the Church is not, and cannot be, the leader of modern so-called progress.

Foreign Events of Catholic Interest.

THE principle to be observed in this Quarterly Summary consists simply in making the interests of Catholicism the centre round which foreign events will be grouped in the order of their relative importance. Accompanying the narrative of facts, there will be comments on their character or possible tendency, whenever, at least, they may be needed, either to avoid misconception, or to enforce a principle. It will often happen, we fear, that events inimical to Catholic interests will have to be recorded, or serious conflicts of opinion and principle between Catholics to be adverted to; yet we shall deem it our duty never to shrink from the candid avowal of facts, nor to halt in a spirit of false compromise between two contradictory principles. The difficulty of arriving at the truth of such details as determine the character of public transactions, is rendered almost insuperable by an unscrupulous partizanship, which distorts facts and knowingly puts and keeps in circulation the most circumstantial falsehoods. In the hands of a faction even the telegraph is converted into an instrument for carrying out a scheme of deliberate deception. Good faith itself, also, is not unfrequently led away in its fervour beyond the exact truth, and thus the difficulty of research is still further increased. But by excluding the exaggerated statements of the well-intentioned defenders of truth, no less than the malicious falsehoods of its opponents, we shall endeavour to arrive at an impartial judgment.

In putting forward the interests of the Church as the characteristic feature of this summary, it must not be supposed that we are merging all interests in one, or that we are overlooking the varied needs and progressive workings of society; on the contrary, we believe that by viewing political and social questions mainly in their bearing on religion, we shall better see our way to their solution than by disjoining things so essentially connected as religion and politics. At all events, such a line of conduct is consistent with the principle which takes the Church as the standard of right and wrong in all the concerns of life. On matters of doubtful character we cannot do better than keep close to the mind of the Church, and follow the instincts and traditions of our Catholic forefathers. Love of liberty, patriotism, desire of knowledge, which at times by their misdirection and by their violent excesses, disturb the very foundations of society, find always in the Catholic Church their true, safe, and natural home. Repudiating, as of course we do, the revolutionary theory of the origin of civil power in all its consequences, yet we by no means consent to be classed as friends and supporters of absolutism. To absolutism, with

its bureaucratic system of centralization and its petty police intervention in all the affairs of life, we have a wholesome and hearty repugnance. This miserable system cramps all spontaneous and individual action; it stifles the breath of liberty, and, in its worst development, reduces man to a mere social machine. Civil liberty, social progress, the principle of self-government, are dear to Catholics, but we hate the Revolution, by whatever name it calls itself, and under each and all of its numerous modifications. By the Revolution we mean—for on this point there must be no misconception—that active and impious spirit which has set itself above all Divine authority, and which, obeying one impulse, following one law, is acting in concert all over Europe with the avowed aim of rooting up the existing institutions of society and the Catholic faith. Its principles were formularized in 1789: the declaration of the rights of man was a deliberate exclusion of religion from public life, a universal denial of the rights of God. This original character has ever since marked the Revolution. The principles of '89, although comprising many truths, yet, interpreted by the spirit of their framers and by the light of their subsequent history as a code, exclusive of all other rights, indirectly, at least, and negatively contradict the Catholic principle of the Divine constitution of society. The Revolution is a political negation of God. It breaks with the past and unsettles the human mind. The Revolution divorces politics from religion. It substitutes civil ordinances for the sacraments, and abolishes public worship. The Revolution forbids synods, outrages the rights of the Holy See and of the Episcopate, suppresses religious orders, and plunders Church property. The Revolution violates domestic rights, and unchristianizes the child. It first degrades and then dissolves marriage. The Revolution assails the rights of society as well as those of God, of the Church, and the family. Society has a right to good government and liberty; the Revolution imperils all government and destroys liberty. Inflaming popular passions by its teaching of a false and unnatural equality, it renders free and temperate government impossible. Society oscillates between the wildest demagoguery and the tyranny of a dictator. And in the struggle, or in the terror that succeeds, liberty is lost. The Revolution sets class against class, and, in turn, tramples on the rights of each. It deprives aristocracy of its rights and privileges, confiscates its hereditary possessions, and then holds it up to the contempt and hatred of the populace. If the middle class, in their turn, resist the encroachments of the Revolution, it falls upon them with redoubled violence, and attacks the very existence of property itself. Anarchy then ensues, and the force of things calls in the dictator and his soldiery. Days of terror are succeeded by years of servitude. The Church is seized upon as an instrument of government, or gagged and persecuted as an enemy. Military rule makes no nice distinctions. Society is in a permanent state of siege; deprived of liberty, it finds solace in degrading self-indulgence and in vicious ostentation. Then comes the period of intellectual stagnation and moral corruption; then love of change, instability, terror: this is Revolution.

THE POLISH INSURRECTION.—The Polish question has two aspects: the one European, the other domestic—two characters: one revolutionary, the other patriotic. The patriotic party demand from the Emperor of Russia,

justice; the revolutionary, war. By justice, the moderate party understand respect for their nationality, liberty for their religion, self-government. In war, the revolutionary party seeks self-aggrandisement, dismemberment of Russia, European disturbance. Rights, just in themselves, the Emperor publicly declares he is willing to concede to the Poles who recognize his sovereign power in Poland. The revolutionists he delivers over without stint to the sword of the Cossack, to the frosts of Siberia, or to the gallows. In its proclamation of the 19th of May, the Secret Committee of Warsaw, or the "National Government," as it now calls itself, shows that what it wants is, not justice, but empire; not good government and liberty, but the destruction of the political existence of Russia as a great empire, and the reconstruction of Poland as it was before 1772. And here the question at once suggests itself, how far does the Polish insurrection partake of a popular character? Is it a national movement or a class movement? Do a very large majority of the inhabitants of the Polish provinces adhere to their Sovereign, or join the insurrection? What, again, is the cause of the outbreak? Is it, as some good Catholics think, a loss of all hope on the part of the people in the justice and in the liberal concessions of the Emperor Alexander, and of all faith in the good government, at Warsaw, of Wielopolski and the Grand Duke Constantine? or is it, as others equally sound believe, the last stroke of a turbulent nobility for an independent kingdom? What hand in its direction has the Polish Emigration which, for thirty years, has been mixed up with every revolutionary undertaking in Europe? On such points as these, perhaps, we have not the means of arriving at a decided opinion; certainly, they are far too wide for discussion in this place. And closely connected with them is the moral and theological question, how far the various conditions unite in the case of Poland, which theologians require in order to make an insurrection permissible. On so grave a matter it is not for us to decide, even had we the sufficient information to warrant us in any confident decision; nor, as will be presently seen, has the Holy Father, in his letter to the Emperor of Russia, given any kind of judgment on the subject, either directly or by implication. But whatever be the true answer to this question, which, after all, is more important than any other, we heartily wish a stop were put to the useless carnage before it provokes a European war. We can ill bear to see all the revolutionary agencies of Europe at work to prolong a struggle which they did their best to excite, in the hope that it might end in a general crusade for the relief of all subject nationalities. But before further noticing the revolutionists of various countries who have taken advantage of Polish disaffection, and whose principles and conduct we are alike eager in condemning, we must fix our attention on the chief cause of the sympathy and indignation so generally felt throughout Europe in this movement. Russian persecution of the Polish Church is the actual cause of the strong feeling that has been excited. Catholic Europe has no sympathy with revolutions; but Catholic Europe has lost its heart to Poland, and chiefly on account of its martyred Church. Nuns have told tales of persecution which have made the heart bleed. Priests of the Polish emigration have carried throughout Europe the traditions of Russian cruelty and Polish sorrow. The persecution had lasted too long to be soon forgotten. Things have altered in Russia, but

memories remain. Alexander pays the penalty due to Nicholas and his predecessors, and Russia to-day is expiating the wrongs she yesterday inflicted on Poland. Thus it is that we account for the very general approval which, especially in France and Belgium, is bestowed by the best Catholics upon the Polish insurrection. A war even on behalf of Polish independence would be popular with many to whom, perhaps, the revolutionary theory of nationalities is an abomination. In Germany and in Italy the expression of sympathy is by no means so general; more qualified in its extent, the adhesion to the Polish movement confines itself, for the most part, to the interests of the Catholic Church, and to the desire to see a good system of government established by Russia, on an honest and durable basis, in all her Polish dependencies. In this state of divided opinion—the extreme and revolutionary party urging on a European war, the moderate and conservative counselling a judicious reconciliation of existing rights and the just claims of nationality—it became known that the Pope had spoken on the Polish difficulty; and Catholics, who are accustomed to give an ever ready ear to Papal allocutions, immediately suspended their judgment. An authentic version of this letter of the Pope to the Emperor of Russia, which was written on the 22nd of April, 1863, has now been published. The letter is not an allocution addressed to the Poles or to the Catholic world, but a friendly though severe remonstrance addressed to the Emperor Alexander. It is a recapitulation of the sins of Russia, for a period of nearly a hundred years, against the liberties of the Polish Church and the rights of the Holy See. This is not the place to give in full this authoritative document; we have, however, made a summary of its contents, together with a translation of its most important passages.

In this Pontifical letter, then, the attention of the Emperor of Russia is called to the principal causes of the actual convulsions, and the remedies which His Holiness believes to be the most efficacious means of restoring calm and tranquillity to minds profoundly agitated by a struggle so fierce and obstinate as is now being carried on in Poland. "With a voice of truth and of justice, a voice free from the lying spirit, and from every human and political interest," the Pope desires to bring to the knowledge of the Emperor certain facts which are the real causes of the continual complaints of unhappy Poland. The Pontifical letter then describes the grievous sufferings which, with brief interruptions, ever since the first partition of the kingdom, have been inflicted upon the clergy and faithful of both rites in the annexed provinces. It refers the Emperor to numerous authentic documents, published from time to time under his predecessors, in which are recorded the spoliation of nearly all the ecclesiastical property; the suppression of very many convents and monasteries of either sex; the promulgation of laws opposed to the authority of the bishops and to the discipline of the Church; the artifices and compulsion, amounting even to violence, which were employed to constrain millions of the Ruthenes to abandon the faith of their fathers; the taking away of innumerable churches from the Catholics to hand them over to the dissenters for their use and benefit; the obligation of educating in the dominant religion all the children born in mixed marriages; the prohibition of direct communication with the Holy See; besides numerous other enactments to the prejudice of the unity of the Catholic Church, and to the disturbance of the consciences of the

faithful. The Pontifical letter states, moreover, that all these measures, enacted to the detriment of the Catholic religion, fell the more heavily upon Poland, inasmuch as they were in direct contravention of treaties solemnly concluded by the emperors of Russia at the various epochs of the successive partitions of Poland, and, in particular, of the treaty of Warsaw, concluded on the 18th of September, 1773, and of that of Grodno, 13th of July, 1792. "In both these treaties," says the Pontifical letter, "the sovereigns of Russia declare solemnly, in assuming the government of the ceded Polish provinces, that the Roman Catholics should be unreservedly maintained in the condition in which they then were: that is, in the free exercise of their faith and discipline, together with the possession of all the churches and ecclesiastical property which they held at the time of their passing under the Russian domination; the new sovereign making an irrevocable promise for himself and his successors to secure in perpetuity to the said Roman Catholics of both rites the tranquil possession of the privileges and the properties of their churches, the free exercise of their faith and discipline, together with all the rights which are attached to them; protesting, finally, that neither the sovereign nor his successors shall ever exercise their rights of sovereignty to the prejudice of the Roman Catholic religion of either rite in the countries which have come under the Russian dominion."

The letter then shows how, from the very first partition of Poland, the Holy See had never failed to protest before the face of the Catholic world, as well as privately to remonstrate with the emperors of Russia, against acts of oppression and violence by which a people that desired the liberty of professing the Catholic faith were forced to abandon their religion. The Emperor is reminded that the Holy See never allowed an opportunity to escape without an attempt to obtain redress of the wrongs which, by an abuse of the civil power, were inflicted on the Church in Poland. Even from the very first, after the partition of Poland, the Holy See, which had, says the letter, in vain attempted to check its disastrous effects, despatched legates to invoke the magnanimity and justice of the Russian emperors in behalf of Catholicism trodden under foot. The Pontiff then reminds Alexander II. that, on the occasion of his coronation, he sent to the imperial court an ambassador extraordinary, and recommended again, at that auspicious moment, the Catholic Church in Poland to the protection of the Emperor, renewing, at the same time, the expression of a desire for the admission of a permanent ambassador at the imperial court. The letter then speaks of the joy with which the Sovereign Pontiff received the intelligence that every obstacle to the reception of a nuncio at the imperial court had been happily removed; and of the surprise and disappointment subsequently caused by an official declaration from the Russian government, in consequence of some communications made to it by the Holy See, that the laws and enactments which, under severe penalties, prohibited all communication between the bishops and the faithful and the representatives of the Holy See at the court of S. Petersburg, were still in full force throughout the imperial dominions. Far from removing such obstacles, the pontifical letter complains that the above-mentioned laws were reproduced in a new ukase from S. Petersburg, dated the 8th of January, 1862, containing articles contrary to the constitution of the Catholic Church and to formal conventions entered

into with the Holy See. This ukase formed the subject of certain requisitions which were communicated in the name of the Sovereign Pontiff by the Cardinal Secretary of State to the imperial government. The letter then alludes to the attempts made, especially in a letter written by the Holy Father on the 31st of January, 1859, to induce the Russian government to discuss some points not included in the concordat of 1847, and loyally to carry out at least those stipulations which had been already agreed to. After in vain waiting for the long-promised reply, great displeasure was excited in Rome by the report, presented to the Emperor, of the committee appointed to examine various matters relating to the convention, a report which plainly showed with what sentiments the members of this committee were animated against the Church, and what little hope there was of a satisfactory issue to the inquiry.

"But all these zealous endeavours of ours, as well as those of our predecessors, having been for the most part in vain," continues the Holy Father, "we are forced to deplore to-day the consequences which have sprung from a system so pernicious, and so contrary to the spirit of the Catholic Church, to the detriment of ecclesiastical discipline in a part of the clergy, whether secular or regular. Taking from the Church one or other of its rights; despoiling the clergy, by little and little, of its property and franchises; regulating education by colleges and universities of obnoxious teaching; arrogating in ecclesiastical colleges or in administrative committees the authority and jurisdiction belonging, of divine right, to the Roman pontiff and to the respective bishops; hindering the regulars from being in correspondence with their superior generals and from receiving their visitations; and, above all, erecting a wall of division between the flock and their universal pastor; it is not to be wondered at if the sanctity of religion be diminished, if *the principles of obedience and subjection taught by it have not cast deep roots*, if the ministers of the sanctuary have begun in some parts to be enervated, and if, lastly, some even of the clergy, whether secular or regular, have fallen away from their duty, and have participated in actions which were becoming neither to their vocation nor to their sacred character. We are very far, your Majesty, from approving that the clergy take part in political convulsions, and take up arms to overthrow the authority of government. We, on the contrary, *deplore and condemn such conduct*; but, at the same time, we wish to point out to your Majesty the origin and cause which brought it about. Let our Apostolic authority regain its salutary influence over your Catholic subjects; let the bishops enter again into the free exercise of their power, according to the sacred canons; let the clergy recover their influence in the instruction and direction of the people; let the regulars depend entirely on their superior generals; let the faithful be free to profess the Catholic religion; and then your Majesty will convince yourself that the *chief cause of the continual political agitations of Poland* was religious oppression, the disturbance of consciences, the decay of the clergy, the degradation of the sacred pastors, the propagation of anti-religious principles and doctrines. We beseech your Majesty to be persuaded that whatever you shall do and set on foot for the tranquillity of the Church, and for the reverence of our holy religion, you will do for the good and advantage of the empire; and that, supporting the Church with open protection, *you will be able to reckon on the*

respect and loyalty of the whole Polish nation, which never was so flourishing and prosperous as when it was free to profess the religion of its fathers. Oh! your Majesty, may the lamentations of this nation, which have resounded through the whole of Europe, and which have even moved hearts indifferent on matters of religion, reach your throne and touch your generous heart. One word from you could give back to a generous people its lost calm and tranquillity, and remove the permanent cause of so much strife and of so many disturbances!" The letter concludes by the Pope's declaring that, whatever may be the effect of his advice and remonstrance, he has, at all events, discharged the grave responsibility which he incurred before God and man.

This letter of Pius IX. is a heavy indictment against Russia for its conduct towards the Church in Poland, and an earnest appeal to Alexander II. for religious liberty. It is no justification to schismatic Russia that, during the greater portion of the period reviewed, there was no Catholic nation which did not sin against the liberties of the Church and the rights of the Holy See. It was an unhappy time: the reign of absolutism was interrupted by the first French Revolution only to resume its tyranny over the State and Church; but in cruelty and injustice despotic Russia far surpassed its competitors, especially in its war against Catholicism, and in its vain attempt to root out Polish nationality. And the manner in which the Church has been treated is still, according to the Pontifical letter, the abiding cause of the continual convulsions in Poland. In defending the liberties and rights of the Church, in sympathizing with the sufferings of the Poles, and in urging a speedy termination of the sanguinary conflict, the Papal letter lends no sanction whatsoever to the ambitious projects of the revolutionary committee of Warsaw, the accepted leaders of the Polish movement. Indeed, it condemns in express terms (as we have just read) such of the clergy as have taken part in the rebellion against the authority of the government. It even promises the Emperor that, if he will only give peace and liberty to the Church, and respect the Catholic faith, he will be able to reckon on the respect and loyalty of the whole Polish nation.

Two obstacles stand in the way of so happy a consummation—the stubborn bigotry of the old Muscovite party, and the presence of the Revolution, stirring up in the hearts of the people revenge and ambition, and invoking on behalf of its lawless projects the intervention of France. In the hope of such foreign aid, blood is now being shed in merciless profusion. But what shall we think of the intervention of revolutionary France in the affairs of Poland? The soldiers of Napoleon overrunning Europe for the liberation of oppressed nationalities, fighting for an idea, inspire confidence in none. We can feel nothing but horror at the thought of such a war—a war revolutionary in its character and in its consequences—a war in which Austria is to remain neutral—for a consideration, so audacious are French speculations—and to which England, with Lord Russell's consent, is to lend her moral support. In such a war, France victorious is Europe crushed. A dismembered Russia, a weakened Austria, Posen and the Rhenish provinces torn from Prussia, Germany cowed and conquered, are some of the results to be feared. But not all—Hungary and Venice will be calling on the "Deliverer"

of Poland and on Victor Emmanuel for liberation: where oppressed nationalities are still to be delivered, thither French armies are still but too ready to march. And Papal Rome will have to be saved once more by some special Providence; or, perhaps, by the armies of France being called away, on the sudden, to settle the Eastern question and to seize the Holy Places, where the heir of the third Napoleon may be crowned King of Jerusalem.

Such results are quite within the range of possibility if a war be once begun for the purpose of altering the map of Europe. That a war in favour of an independent kingdom of Poland would have such a revolutionary character there can be little doubt; not only because it would be made use of for revolutionary ends, but because it would have to be worked out by revolutionary agencies. Every revolutionist in Europe, every liberal of the darker dye, every sworn enemy of the existing order of society, is pledged to bring about such a result out of the actual Polish movement. For this purpose the activities of the secret societies are now transferred from the soil of Italy to unhappy Poland. The Hungarian, the Frenchman, and the Italian are shedding the blood of the Polish peasants in order to destroy Russia and set up an independent Poland. Colonel Nullo, Garibaldi's chief lieutenant in the Italian war, was struck down by a Russian bayonet, and his daring band perished in the attempt to avenge their leader. It comes to pass as the Bishop of Orleans predicted: "Poland calls on the armies of France, but the vultures of the Revolution answer the call." All the revolutionary strength of Europe, from the throne of France to the rock of Caprera, is concentrated on the Polish insurrection. Against the success of this ambitious policy, against such a revolutionary war, lighted up by the ruler of France for projects of his own, we look with confidence to Austria; to the steadfast policy of that great conservative empire, so slow to be moved from the path of rectitude, so deaf to the blandishments of the Western Powers, so ready with diplomatic resources. She will yet save Europe from the impending war, and draw down upon herself again the maledictions of the disappointed Revolution. We have confidence, also, in the ultimate good sense of England, in the strength of the conservative feeling in the country, which will prevent the nation from drifting into another Russian war, not less purposeless and still more mischievous than the Crimean.

Another element which adds still further confusion in the consideration of this intricate Polish question, is the religious sentiment. In France the almost universal feeling among the clergy, and even in conservative writers, is in favour of an immediate marching of French armies to the rescue. A reconstituted Poland is a French idea, and quite a Catholic sentiment in France. On this topic Montalembert, with his fiery and eloquent enthusiasm, is a perfect representative man. He would almost overlook, he declares, the loss of liberty in France under the existing dynasty, if only its present ruler would by his arms give freedom to Poland. More sober views and sounder political principles prevail, however, both in Catholic Germany and in Papal Italy. Justice to Poland is thought to be quite compatible with respect for the existing rights of Russia; and it is clearly perceived that the interests of the Catholic Church in Poland are more likely to be promoted by the observance of law and order than by the triumph of the revolutionary spirit and party.

The Revolution trades on the Catholic sentiment of Europe ; it even withdraws its more prominent members for awhile from the scene, in order to conciliate what it calls the good will of the "clericals." On this account the sword of Garibaldi was courteously declined for a season by the Polish leaders. The time is not yet ripe for the great guerilla leader's intervention. He is reserved for Hungary or Venice, if the time should come when Austria is compelled, by the presence of French armies on the Rhine, to take up arms for Prussia against Europe in revolution. It is, however, scarcely to be wondered at if a generous sympathy, no less than Catholic sentiment, should often lead men astray in regard to this Polish question. There are large numbers of persons whose political judgment is formed, not by studying the principles of the Catholic Church, but by looking to what they take to be the immediate interests of Catholic populations. If, then, the Catholic sentiment be stronger in France than is political judgment based on Catholic principles, can we wonder that in Poland itself the religious feeling and the keen remembrance of past persecutions should operate strongly with the Polish clergy, and make many of them disaffected to the civil power ?

But, after all, home difficulties, though comparatively slight, are often the hardest to deal with. Alexander II., unintimidated by threats of foreign and revolutionary invasion, may yet quail before the determined bigotry of a small Muscovite party. Greek prejudice is fierce, and Russian liberality new. It requires greater courage to give perfect liberty to the Catholic Church at S. Petersburg, than to taunt Napoleon with the Polish emigration and its social relations at Paris. But if he wish to preserve Poland from ruin and revolution, Alexander II. ought to lose not a moment in removing the just causes of discontent. Let the bigotry of the old Muscovite party interpose no longer vexatious delays and obstacles to the reception of a Papal legate at the imperial court. In compliance with the demands of Pius IX., and as a token of his courage and sincerity, let the Emperor of Russia make a bonfire at S. Petersburg of all the old statutes and acts which stand in the way of a full recognition of the rights of the Catholic Church ; and then the ashes of these sanguinary parchments, though a handful merely, will have more power in putting down the insurrection than all the gunpowder stored in the arsenals of Moscow. Such a signal act of justice alone would deprive the ambitious clique of discontented nobles of their power to do mischief, and take away for ever from the determined revolutionist the sympathy of Europe. For such a settlement of this unhappy and sanguinary struggle we ought all, in obedience to the Pope's desire, to labour and pray.

We had prepared a summary of the diplomatic correspondence, in which the questions of right, of fact, and of expediency were warmly and vigorously discussed ; but we prefer to leave the matter on the broad basis on which the Papal letter has placed it. The Pope has touched the nerve of the question—religious persecution—and it has thrilled through Europe. All Europe, with one voice, claims from Russia freedom for the long-persecuted Church in Poland. What we have to contend for, then, is not the vicious project of a reconstituted Poland as it was before 1772, but the full recognition by Russia of the rights and liberties of the Catholic Church, a settled and constitutional system of government for Poland, and respect for

her distinctive nationality, as complete and liberal as that now shown by Austria to the hereditary usages and traditional rights of her various subject races. On the occasion of the great ceremonial in honour of the celebrated and wonderful picture of our Saviour, which is carried in procession only in times of great public peril to Italy or Rome, the Cardinal Vicar has published an order for public prayers, as on an occasion when it was necessary to have recourse to extraordinary means in order to appease the anger of God. In this order the following allusion is made to Poland, and that, as we are able to state, at the particular desire of the Sovereign Pontiff. "The Holy Father," it states, "desires also on this solemn occasion that we should put up to God special prayers for unhappy Poland, which, to his great grief, is become at this moment the scene of carnage and bloodshed. The Polish nation, which was always Catholic, and has acted as a rampart against the invasion of error, assuredly deserves that we should pray for her, in order that she may be delivered from the ills which afflict her; and that, never forfeiting such a character, she may remain faithful to the mission which God has confided to her, of not only keeping, but of preserving intact and inviolable, by the unanimous consent of her people, the standard of the Catholic faith, and the religion of their fathers."

In this prayer Catholics all over the world, who have heard of the faith and sufferings of Poland, will, doubtless, cordially join.

THE FAUSTI TRIAL.—The trial of Fausti and his companions for conspiracy against the Roman government—which ended in the condemnation of Fausti to penal servitude for life, and in the sentence of his fellow-conspirators to penal servitude for periods varying according to the degree of guilt in each—is a subject of so much interest, and throws so strong a light on the conduct of the revolutionary government of Sardinia, as to deserve more attention than it has yet received. The Liberal press* have passed over its singular revelations almost without remark. The trial was conducted with the most praiseworthy liberality, and great licence was allowed in the defence of the accused. The evidence was overwhelming as to their guilt, and conclusive as to the participation of the Sardinian authorities in the plot. Some of the documentary evidence was stolen during the progress of the trial, the keeper of the papers having been bribed by the secret agents of the Roman Committee to decamp with all the documents he could lay his hands on. By means of false keys he was enabled to make himself master of some of the documents, with which he escaped into Sardinia. Although it did not succeed in breaking the links of the evidence, the attempt sufficiently showed the alarm that was felt by the agents of the Revolution, both in Rome and in Turin, many of whom were compromised by the revelations made in these papers. Nothing, indeed, could exceed the rage of the revolutionary party, when, in

* The *Spectator*, on the authority of the Roman Committee, is able to state that the numerous documents produced in evidence, and even the letters of Fausti himself, were all *forgeries*. The *Spectator* ought to be more careful of its character for shrewdness, than to endorse so clumsy a defence of itself on the part of the Roman Committee.

the course of this singular trial, the agencies were brought to light by which those public revolutionary demonstrations were got up, which from time to time, during the last few years, have been attempted in Rome. The Roman Committee, which receives its chief instructions, as well as supplies of money, from Turin, is now in complete disarray. Many of its members have fled from Rome, while such as remain are paralyzed by the discovery of their secret machinations.

The manner in which Cavaliere Fausti, who for many years had enjoyed a great reputation for integrity, piety, and devotion to the Holy See, was gained over to the revolutionary party, was, it appears, as follows. More than thirty years ago he was a member of the Carbonari—of which, by the way, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was also a member at the same time—and secretly sworn to advance on all occasions the views of the society. In the disturbances of 1830 he took an active part; but after Austria had quelled the movement and punished the ringleaders, Fausti, who was not very gravely compromised, retired into private life, and to honest ways of living. He came to Rome, was brought under Cardinal Antonelli's notice, and received an appointment in the civil service. His activity and administrative ability attracted the favour of the Secretary of State; and he rose high in the service, and was ultimately attached, in an official capacity, to the Cardinal's person. In the year 1860, the revolutionary committee made overtures to him and large offers of money. Fausti appears at once to have fallen into their views, and to have identified himself with their cause. He was exactly suited as a medium of communication between the patrons of the Revolution in Turin and their agents in Rome. His position in Cardinal Antonelli's service raised him above suspicion, while it gave him also peculiar means of information. In one of his letters he boasts of his immunity from suspicion, and even chuckles at the treacherous part he was playing. Through his hands large sums of money passed from Turin, to be spent in fomenting disturbances in Rome, or in gaining fresh adherents by bribery, or in corrupting public morality. Perhaps the most revolting business he was set to do was the attempt to destroy the reputation of the Queen of Naples. In one of his letters he acknowledges the receipt of 100 scudi for the manufacture of some obscene photographs representing the Queen of Naples; and a woman who assisted in this infamous work turned approver.

This celebrated trial commenced on the 29th of May of the current year. The names and occupations of the accused are thus set forth in the indictment:—

- 1st. Augustus Gulmanelli; a Roman; unmarried; a sculptor of cameos; age 31 years.
- 2nd. Giovanni Venanzi; a Roman; unmarried; in business; age about 42 years.
- 3rd. Achilles Matriale, surnamed "il Moretto," or "il Napolitano;" unmarried; born at Monte San Giovanni, province of Frosinone; a mechanician; age about 32 years.
- 4th. Alessandro di Martino; unmarried; a Roman; aged 44 years; a notary.
- 5th. Leopold Calza; agent of a lottery office; age 48 years; unmarried.

- 6th. Pietro Barberi; a Roman; unmarried; age 41 years; cow-butcher; born at Civita Vecchia.
- 7th. Baldanare Ferri; a Roman; unmarried; surgeon attached to the Hospital San Giacomo; age 30 years.
- 8th. Stanislas de Mauro, surnamed "Lollo" and "the Proud;" a Roman; unmarried; aged 23 years; a surgical student, practising at the Hospital della Consolazione.
- 9th. Domenico Catufi; aged 24 years; unmarried; a native of Fabriano; an engraver in metals and decorative painter.
- 10th. Ludovico Cavaliere Fausti; married, having seven children; born at Poreta, in the diocese of Spoleta; aged 47 years; despatch bearer.

The accused, with the exception of Fausti, are all single men, and without family ties, and, perhaps, on that account more liable to be mixed up in dangerous enterprises. Many of them have been, or still are, Freemasons. Without stopping to specify the individual crimes, or to enter into details of the indictment and defence, we will restrict ourselves to such general data as show the nature of the trial, and which will enable us to discover the intrigues, the daring, and the criminality of that Italian revolution whose orders these condemned men have only transmitted or executed.

Secret societies have, for a long time, existed in Italy. Their names have differed at different epochs. At first there were the Freemasons; then came the Carbonari; and then Young Italy; then Italy of the People: but, whatever their name, their end was always the same. Of late years the various elements of these societies have been fused, and they now form the "Alta Italia," which receives its orders and directions from the government of Turin. It has been very busy in the Pontifical provinces. Matters of a most curious nature, but most compromising for certain personages in Sardinia, have come to light during the legal investigations made in the Marches. From papers seized on Venanzi, from documents collected in different quarters, and from legal investigations pursued with great activity for more than a year (since the arrest of Venanzi, on the 22nd February, 1862), it appears that the Piedmontese party was founded and organized in Rome by an agent of the Sardinian government. This agent was the Marquis Migliorati, the then minister, *ad interim*, of the court of Sardinia at the Holy See. He took the first steps in the formation of this party by collecting around him a certain number of chosen men, and tracing out to them the revolutionary plan for making Italy united and free—*una e libera*. He set up a committee for the guidance of the Piedmontese, and gave it the name of the Roman National Committee—Comitato Nazionale Romano. It was composed of persons of rank, whose names are now known to the authorities. After M. Migliorati had left Rome, two persons, then strangers to the committee, and whose names are now also known, one after the other, took his place in the direction of the party. It is affirmed—we are condensing in this account from an Abstract (*Ristretto*) of the official report of the trial, which is now being published—that they were formally authorized by the Cabinet of Turin to fulfil this office. These two new chiefs had also to leave Rome; the direction of the committee was thereupon offered to several of its members in succession, but was

declined. The leadership then fell into the hands of men socially less influential, but members of the higher grades of Freemasonry; and henceforth the organization and action of the Piedmontese party were regulated according to the forms of Freemasonry itself. The work was distributed among the different members of the committee. Some were engaged in publishing and circulating tracts, and in corresponding with the newspapers; others in opening subscriptions and making collections; others, again, were charged with organizing bodies of men for military purposes and preparing them for action. But since the chief committee were anxious to keep a little in the dark, a sub-committee was formed, and entrusted with a portion of the powers of the full committee. This sub-committee was composed of ten members, acting as chiefs, and having under them fifteen individuals as chiefs of sections (*capisezione*). Fourteen of these were entrusted with the command over the fourteen districts (*riioni*) of Rome, and the fifteenth had to watch over the subscriptions and monthly fees. These chiefs of section received the orders of the committee, or sub-committee, and had to transmit them to, and see to their execution in, their respective sections. Under their orders were placed the military chiefs, charged with the command of the soldiers of the party, called chiefs of squadrons. These chiefs of squadrons were fifty-six in number, that is to say, four to each of the districts of Rome; and had under them inferior officers, whose number and election were left to their choice. Each squadron was limited to 150 men; but this maximum, for want of adherents, was never reached in any of the sections. Besides this Piedmontese party, thus organized, and whose chiefs, especially in the higher ranks, were frequently changed, there was another and distinct class of members who might be called honorary, for they were not allowed to take any part in the action or to mix themselves up with the affairs of the party, but were called upon only to contribute from their purses to the success of the society. They were simply paying associates (*semplici socii solventi*), and were often made use of in helping to spread false and extravagant reports whenever it was thought necessary to create excitement in the public mind. They were, moreover, made to take part in the got-up promenades in the Forum during the Carnival. The names of all those who formed the committee at the time of the arrest of Venanzi are in the hands of justice; the names, also, of the chiefs of sections are known, several of whom belong to the most active of the Freemasons.

The Abstract which we are analyzing states that it could cite the names of a great number of persons affiliated to the Piedmontese party, many of whom belong to the highest class of society, who ought to have set a good example to others, and who were bound by their very office and position to put down the conspirators instead of adding to their number.

The legal investigations have also brought to light, in many instances, the names of such as have received money for services done, and also of several who have bargained beforehand, in the case of a change of government, for the preservation of their places and of their perquisites; lastly, the names of certain functionaries and officials have been discovered who are in the receipt of monthly pay from the Piedmontese party, thus shamefully enjoying a double salary.

According to the original idea of the organizers of the Piedmontese party,
VOL. I.—NO. II. [*New Series.*]

the action of the committee was to have been restricted to secret work, and to the propagandism of unitarian ideas. To help on the course of events, to propagate the Revolution, to attack and criticise the temporal power of the Holy See, to spread abroad principles and writings antagonistic to the Pontifical rule, and to prepare the people to receive a new form of government—such was to have been their mission. But the society, composed as it was, could not remain inactive and patiently await events. The component parts belonging to Freemasonry or to the sect of the Carbonari often forced the lead from the directing committee, and acted irrespective of its authority. One of the most determined attempts of the society was that of tampering with the fidelity of the Pontifical soldiers; but although some defections occurred in their ranks, the revolutionary party has not much to boast of on that score.

The members and leaders of this society were at no loss in finding occasion and scope for their peculiar work. To them are traced the libels and calumnies against the Holy See, the various demonstrations hostile to the Pontifical government, the subscription and the presentation of the sword to Garibaldi, the protestations against the Carnival, the Bengal fires in the public streets, the demonstration at S. Joseph's on the 19th of March, 1859, the disturbances at the Roman university and at the theatres. It was they who hoisted in the night the Italian flags, or scattered the Italian colours in the streets by day. But their chief energy was directed against the King of Naples. No pains, no labour, no money were spared to bring him into discredit, to defame the queen as well as himself, or to get possession of his papers. Their object was, at all hazards, to find proof of the participation of Francis II. in the Neapolitan reaction. To attain this end, a vast spy system was established round the Quirinal, and every action of the Roman government was noted. The revolutionary party were lavish in promises of money. Among other bribes, they offered 8,000 francs to anyone who could lay hands on private papers of importance to which the name of the king might happen to be attached, or which could be made use of in such a manner as to implicate him in the reactionary movement. They bribed a lady of the Neapolitan court, charging her to steal the papers of the king, or at least to transcribe them, and exciting her to this act of treachery by promises of the most lavish recompense, and by giving her a high grade in the society. From the papers found on Venanzi, it appears that some personages of the Neapolitan court, whose names are known, had undertaken to deliver up to the party autograph papers of the king, on condition of having secured to them a peaceable retreat to Naples. Negotiations for this view were carried on with the Piedmontese government, and the Roman authorities are in possession of a document headed "Office of the Lieutenant-General of the King in the Neapolitan Provinces," which leaves no doubt on the matter. In this document, it is said, not only that General Cialdini promises to the petitioners a safe restoration to Naples, but that he intends to reward them with a thousand ducats each. This letter is written and signed by Signor Viglio, who, under Signor Spaventa, was chief of the interior police, but was subsequently attached by General Cialdini to the lieutenant-general's office. All these promises, however, and were made in vain. Even though by the aid

of false keys men were let into Neapolitan houses, where it was imagined that papers relating to the reactionary movement might be found, yet even this shameless intrusion and dishonourable violation of domestic security, as was the case at Borgo-Nuovo and at Campo di Fiori, led to no results whatsoever. A system of patrols was established in Rome and a strict watch kept at the gates of the city; moreover, large sums were offered to those who would betray the movements of the reactionary party; men were posted round the Quirinal to keep a constant look-out, and to note with care all who entered or left the palace.

A watch so well arranged and so vigilant, which, nevertheless, was unable to discover anything against the King of Naples, may be taken as in itself a most striking proof of the falsehood of the calumnies directed against his conduct at Rome. All the infamous attacks levelled at the young Queen of Naples are too well known to need recital here. The names of those who took part in these disgraceful proceedings, the photographer as well as the persons who lent themselves to these licentious enormities, are in the possession of the authorities.

The unbridled hatred of the Revolution against the royal family was still unsatisfied. Three times an attempt was made on the life of the king. The first was on the evening of Easter Sunday, 1861, at the time the Girandola was being illuminated. Everything had been arranged for carrying out this horrible project; the explosive shells were prepared and in their places; but fortunately the precautions taken by the French military authorities forestalled this criminal attempt. The second occasion was when Francis II. was on his way to his château at Caprocala; and the last in January, 1862, as he was about to leave the Quirinal by the Panetterian gate. The documents found among the papers of Venanzi leave no doubt as to the originators of these murderous designs. At Rome, as everywhere else, the Revolution shows its true nature by its instinctive love for blood, for fire, and for destruction. The firing off of the grenades is attributed to the Revolutionary Committee, and the conflagration of the theatre Aliberti, which was to have been followed by the destruction of divers monuments, appears, according to the documents brought forward in evidence, to have been designed by them, and carried into effect in accordance with their orders. On Venanzi was found a list of 5,208 proscribed persons doomed to death by this secret tribunal. Some of the names which were inscribed in this list were those of unfortunate individuals who had already been found assassinated in the streets of Rome. Such a coincidence is fatal against the Roman Committee. During this trial it came to light that the order had been given to put to death in the hospitals all the poor fellows whose devotion to the cause of the Holy See was known, or who happened to belong to the Neapolitan royalist party, or, again, such as had escaped from the military conscription of Piedmont. And, horrible to say, according to the evidence brought forward in the course of the investigation, this infernal project was actually carried into effect in some of the hospitals, where the sick and wounded who fell under the dreadful ban of the Revolution had poison mixed with their medicine, or were murdered under the surgical knife, without hesitation or remorse. These wretched agents of the society went so far as to

commit the most atrocious barbarities on the dead bodies of their enemies. The corpses were put up as marks to be shot at with revolvers, and their naked flesh was lacerated by the daggers or knives of these secret assassins.

The demeanour of Fausti at the trial was characterised by extreme effrontery. In the commencement he endeavoured to brazen out the accusations brought against him. He insisted on taking part in the proceedings, and on speaking in his own defence, in spite of the advice of his advocate. The court listened with patience to a long apology, which he had prepared, of his conduct, both public and private. During the examination which followed the accused systematically denied every fact brought forward against him, even such as he had previously admitted. But his mendacious audacity broke down by degrees under the keen cross-examination which he had to undergo, and beneath the weight of the evidence brought against him. Letters in his own handwriting were produced, and, at last, to every question put to him, he bowed his head in acquiescence, or replied, "I leave to my advocate the care of my defence." The complete break-down of the previous system of defence; the fallen countenance of Fausti himself; and the bootless attempts of his able advocate to explain away irresistible evidence, were palpable to all. There was no dispute as to the facts, no difficulty in bringing the guilt home to the accused; the evidence against the prisoners was minute and complete. Perfect liberty was granted to the defence. The court never interrupted the proceedings, but fairly and patiently weighed the evidence. The court even allowed, so jealous were they of the liberty of defence, Dionisi, Fausti's advocate, to hand in, during the progress of the trial, a memorial accusing the judges (that is to say, prelates whose wisdom, science and benevolence are proverbial in the judicial world) of being blinded by passion, and of having conspired for the destruction of Fausti.

The prisoners were all found guilty, and sentenced to the punishment accorded to their crimes by the penal code of Rome. In the indictment, be it added, there were other counts, such as assassination and arson.

This trial has let in a flood of light upon the dark doings of the revolutionary party. The convenient obscurity which enshrouded their proceedings has been dispersed. The society can no longer be called secret. Its organization is known, and its crimes are made public. The chiefs of the revolutionary committee still sit in the capital of Sardinia, but the agents are expiating the common crime in the galleys. No wonder that the whole hierarchy of the Revolution is in a state of extreme confusion. They who hate the light have been dragged before the public eye in a court of justice. Their hiding-places are laid bare. Who shall say what persuasions, what threats, were used to suppress this trial, or to make justice miscarry? Every nerve was strained to intimidate witnesses, and even to arrest justice in its own court. The judges were threatened by anonymous letters with death if the accused were not acquitted. The Roman National Committee—which ought, in reality, to be called a Turinese Committee, after the place whence it draws its inspirations and its funds—had during the night placarded the most frequented streets of Rome with a warning, of which the following is a literal translation:—

"From an examination just made of the papers appertaining to the Venanzi and Fausti trial, and of other documents which have fallen into the hands of the National Committee, it is evident that the undermentioned individuals are deserving of public infamy as common spies and informers. (Here follow eighteen names, with, in most cases, their precise addresses.) In holding up these men to universal execration, the committee trust that a study of these documents will not lead to a discovery of other renegades and rascals of a like description. Should this hope, however, be disappointed, they will not fail to devote their names also to a like infamy. The committee has, moreover, to deplore in this affair the calumnious reports which, under the mask of flaming patriots, some sad and miserable men have put into circulation against honourable citizens, in order to further their own dark designs. The committee entreat the public to give neither ear nor faith to these calumnies; but if these underhand devices be still carried on, they will give up the names of these detractors also to public indignation."

"(Signed) THE ROMAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

"Rome, 26th May, 1863."

Well may the Piedmontese government desire to wash its hands of the excesses which, in the name of Italian liberty, the Mazzinians are in the habit of committing. Well may they protest against their deeds of blood, for this list, given by the Roman Committee, is, in fact, a list of proscriptions: this warning is an appeal to the dagger. At Rome, where the principles and the proceedings of the Mazzinian party are well known, no one is deceived about the meaning of the above placard.

The split between the advanced patriots and the Piedmontese, which has for some time been going on throughout the Peninsula, has resulted at Rome in an open division. In spite of the protestations of the Roman National Committee, founded, as we have seen, by the Marquis Migliorati at the time he was an accredited minister of Sardinia at the Holy See, its friends and members are breaking up into two opposing factions. The party of action, finding the National Committee too moderate and pusillanimous, has founded at Rome a committee of its own. In the course of the Fausti trial, which brought so many hidden things to light, it came out that the deeds of blood committed during the last three years at Rome, were done, for the most part, by the Mazzinians, or, at least, by those of the Piedmontese party who were inclined to go over to the opposite faction. Venanzi, for instance, said that he never ceased protesting against the scenes of the 29th of June, 1861, prepared by some hotheads of the party. To-day it is clearer than ever that the Mazzinians have the upper hand. The National Committee is doing all in its power to keep its adherents together, but new desertions are taking place every day. The Roman Committee has issued an address to its party, in which it quotes from *La Gazzetta Ufficiale dell' Umbria* a warning directed against the Mazzinians. "The party of action," says the *Official Gazette*, dated 1st July, "after a long agitation, seems on the point of gathering up its forces to make some foolish attempt upon Rome. They have spread the report that they are acting, if not with the consent, at least with the knowledge of the Sardinian government." The *Gazette* formally denies that the government tolerates in any wise such projects. If once, indeed, they were of use, they are so no longer, for to-day the conditions of Italy are changed. "The government," adds the journal, "although it will never lose sight of the Roman question, yet will not be forced

to act against its will, without regard to its political situation or to its external relations. Neither will it cede the initiative of this great work of regeneration to any party, but will contest and put down every such attempt from what quarter soever it may come." Embodying this official warning in its address, and adopting its maxims, the Roman Committee writes as follows :—

"May this warning not be lost upon you, O Romans! Close your ranks; show yourselves inaccessible to the suggestions of agitators who seek to disunite you, to recruit from among your ranks men to execute their senseless enterprises. Reject as treason, or as a snare, any order or printed appeal which does not come to you through the ordinary channel of chiefs of sections or chiefs of squadrons at Rome, or from the national committees in the provinces. Do not be deceived by fallacious promises, by lying hopes, which will end only in sterile sacrifices, ruinous alike to yourselves and to your country. The supreme day of action, though near at hand, is not yet come for our poor Rome. When it breaks,—that day so impatiently expected,—your National Committee will not be slow in summoning you to the last effort, and to a certain victory. Evviva il re! Viva Italia!

"(Signed) THE NATIONAL ROMAN COMMITTEE.

"Rome, 15th July, 1863."

It is as well that the divisions in the revolutionary party should be made known; it is, also, well to show the complicity of the Sardinian government with the revolutionary movement in Rome, although it seeks its supporters just now among the less extreme of the revolutionary societies. Difficult must the task be to preserve the peace and safety of Rome against so well-organized a party, backed up as it is, since the Fausti trial at least, by the no-longer-hidden countenance of Sardinia. As long as Piedmont intervenes in the affairs of Rome by its secret and revolutionary agencies, so long, at the very least, must French troops remain to protect Rome against the joint attacks of Sardinia and the Revolution.

In the course of the Fausti trial, the names of the venerable Cardinals Marini, Mertel, and Di Pietro were brought before the public by the revolutionary party as implicated in the conspiracy against the Roman government. It was alleged that in the files which the Roman Committee had caused to be purloined compromising facts were to be found. On the death of Cardinal Marini—which has since happened—the falsehood has been repeated with circumstantial details. The *Nazione*, the organ of the Revolution, has by means of the telegraph sent the absurd story through Europe, as veritable news, that Cardinal Marini had died of grief, because the Pope would not allow him to insert, a few days before his death, in the official part of the *Giornale di Roma*, a denial of all complicity in the Fausti schemes. Cardinal Marini is dead, and the revolutionary faction do not scruple to calumniate the dead as well as the living. But the truth of the matter is, that both Cardinals Mertel and Di Pietro, equally accused with the late Cardinal Marini by the revolutionary faction of disloyalty, have lately been promoted to offices of great trust in the Pontifical States. The Roman official journal, without descending to details, thus remarks on "the cynical impudence of the revolutionary press, which, to gain its own impious ends, lays aside common honesty, and publishes from day to day the most shameless

reports, the most hideous calumnies, and the most absurd inventions, the results merely of its hatred against the government of the Holy See. It would be as tiresome as it is superfluous," continues the *Giornale di Roma*, "to refer, one by one, to these strange publications, which have no bottom to them, and merit no other refutation than a contemptuous silence. Nevertheless, in order to give just vent to the indignation felt by so many, and a not less just satisfaction to persons whose principles have laid them open from time to time to the most obstinate slanders, it has been thought fit to hold up, once for all, to public execration this criminal system pursued to-day by the revolutionary faction." It is to be hoped that these remarks will be sufficient to make honest men see what value ought to be attached to the articles and correspondence of certain journals.

PROCESSION OF THE SANTISSIMO SALVATORE.—The procession in honour of the Miraculous Portrait has just been held at Rome. This procession is never ordered unless in times of great public danger, or when great calamities and evils threaten Christian society. The last time this grand ceremonial took place was under Leo XII. During all the commotions, wars, and revolutions which have since occurred, in presence of political crimes and of sacrilegious usurpations—when even the sanctity of Rome was not respected—the Sacred Portrait was never borne in penitential sorrow beyond the precincts of the chapel Sancta Sanctorum in the church of S. John Lateran. This procession of the Santissimo Salvatore is now ordered by Pope Pius IX. to avert the evils threatening Italy and Christianity. Although there has been great reserve, and little has been said about the matter, it is easy to see that the very highest importance is attached to this act of the Holy See. The prudence of Rome is proverbial, and the absence of all desire, without grave necessity, to disturb men's minds, is part of her divine wisdom; but from this act it is evident, although we may not as yet sufficiently realize it, that we are living in days of great impending dangers and judgments. In the order for public prayers the Cardinal Vicar explains the motives of this extraordinary and sacred procession: he indicates very clearly the dangers which threaten the Church, and implies that the Holy See, in spite of the actual state of things, calls for the greatest watchfulness and care in its defence.

"This Sacred Portrait," says the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, "never leaves the place where it is venerated but on the gravest and most exceptional occasions, and when the most pressing need exists of satisfying the Divine justice, and of obtaining for the people special graces. There is no need for many words to convince everyone that, in the perilous times in which we live, and in which deadness of faith produces such great evils, it is more than ever necessary to have recourse to extraordinary means to appease the anger of God, justly irritated against us, and avert the chastisements which our sins justly draw down upon us. In order that the punishments which we already endure be not followed by graver punishments which may await us if we delay in returning to God by sincere repentance, we ought now to do penance, not only for our own sins, but also for those which in our day more than ever deluge the earth. In our day, when all rights, human and divine, are denied; when the impiety of man goes so far as to blaspheme, in

the most shameless manner, the Majesty of God, to deny the most sacred dogmas of our faith, among others the very Divinity of Jesus Christ, the reverential homage which we shall pay to the Sacred Portrait of the God-Man, Saviour of the world, will serve also as a reparation for the outrages which His Divine Person has recently received from the impious productions of a sacrilegious pen. To these generous motives, which ought to excite us to honour our Divine Saviour, we Romans have special motives of our own, which ought to prompt us to offer with zeal to our Lord a tribute of praise and thanksgiving. These motives are the special benefits which without ceasing, more especially in our days, the Divine Mercy bestows on our city. Who among us does not know the deluge of evils which inundates the peoples of nearly the whole of Italy? To enumerate them here would only serve to make everyone who has the feelings of faith and of charity for his brethren shudder with horror. Let us, then, draw a veil over so many miseries, and let us recall them only to implore with greater fervour and zeal that an end be put to them. Nevertheless, may a hymn of thanksgiving go up towards God, who by an evident miracle of His mercy has vouchsafed to save our Rome from the attacks of an unbridled revolution, which, while it has covered neighbouring cities and countries with confusion and ruins, finds itself arrested by the Divine arm at the gate of the city where sits the Supreme Pontiff." In order the more to incite the faithful to come and venerate this sacred memorial, and to pray with fervour for the intentions of the Holy Father, various indulgences are accorded.

The Pope, it appears, was requested to order the Procession of the Santissimo Salvatore in 1860, and again in 1862, and refused to accede to the prayer, not wishing to create an alarm in the public mind. His Holiness is said now to have consented, not so much on account of new political complications, as in consequence of the great increase of open atheism, and the spread of works denying the truth of Scripture and our Lord's Divinity. The impious writings to which allusion is made by the Cardinal Vicar appear more especially to be Rénan's "*Vie de Jésus*," which is being now translated into Italian all over the different provinces subject to Piedmont, and is even recommended by the *Indipendente* as the "most evangelical work since the Gospels." A book of Proudhon's, "*La Justice de la Révolution*," dedicated openly to *Satan*, is also doing infinite mischief in all the towns of Upper Italy, where the reproductions of the most infamous and blasphemous French works are greedily read. The procession, which is especially devoted to the Divinity of Christ, was most solemn. In this act of public reparation for the scandals of infidelity, and of public profession of Christian truths, an immense concourse of people took part. The piazza and church of S. John Lateran were crowded with persons of all ranks and classes: priests, soldiers, monks, natives of Rome, strangers of all tribes and tongues, peasants from the country round Rome, clad in their picturesque costume, infants in their mothers' arms, ambassadors in their carriages, thronged the streets through which the procession was to pass.

The line was kept by French and Pontifical soldiers. The whole of this immense multitude was grave and recollected. At four o'clock the procession issued from the Basilica. It was headed by the clergy of the seven

great churches of Rome, and was followed by committees, guilds, religious orders, multitudes of clergy, and people of every grade, all joining in the chaunt of the litanies with a fervour and an enthusiasm that, from its depth and reality, was very striking. The Roman Committee had placarded overnight, on their accustomed places, unseemly insults and provocations, but no notice was taken of them. They had sent circulars round on the Sunday morning with the object of preventing people from attending, containing threatening notices, a measure which, by increasing the attendance, only served to show the little hold they have on the Roman population. The Pope did not himself assist in the procession. The Sacred Portrait was carried from the Lateran and was placed on the altar in S. Maria Maggiore, where it was visited by thousands and thousands of persons.

The day after the procession the Pope went in full state to the church of S. Maria del Popolo; there was great cheering in the crowd on the piazza and all down the Repetta through which he passed. The religious orders of Rome went by turns to venerate the Santissimo Salvatore, and to keep perpetual watch. The Basilica of S. Maria Maggiore, where the Sacred Picture was placed, has been the scene of a pilgrimage which, for its fervour and depth of devotion, has surprised even those who never doubted the power which religion has on the Roman population. From six o'clock in the morning the church has been filled with crowds of people, whose recollected demeanour has been most edifying. It is computed that about three thousand persons received communion there every morning. The clergy of the different parishes, the confraternities, the religious orders went on this holy pilgrimage each day in procession. It was a singular sight, and at times, we can well believe, most imposing. On the fifth day of the exposition, about five o'clock in the evening, the Holy Father, accompanied by the whole College of Cardinals, went to offer up his supplications before the high altar of the Basilica, where the Sacred Picture was placed. The crowd was immense both in the church and in the streets through which His Holiness passed: he was received everywhere with an unbounded enthusiasm. There could be no doubt in the minds of all who witnessed this ovation, of the popularity of the Pope in Rome. This great religious manifestation was wanted in these days. The solemn act of reparation and public profession of faith in the Divinity of our Lord which the Pope has made, has already produced such an effect on the public mind as will make this procession remarkable in the religious annals of his glorious Pontificate.

The Sacred Picture is attributed by an ancient tradition to S. Luke. In 726 S. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, to save it from the fury of the iconoclasts, sent it to Pope Gregory II. The Santissimo Salvatore has always been reputed miraculous. It is pronounced to be of the very earliest school of art, and, though rude enough in its execution, is said to be a very impressive picture, the traces of the Passion on the Face of our Lord being rendered with almost painful truth and expression.

For forty-three days preceding the Penitential Procession "the miraculous image of Most Holy Mary, venerated under the title of 'Our Advocate,' in Vicovaro, has daily renewed," says the Roman *Monitore* of the 3rd of September, "the prodigy, sometimes more and sometimes less apparent, of

aversion professed at the present day against ancient systems? Is it not said that we live in an age of progress? You abrogate the codes which were in force a few years ago; you introduce new laws and new modes of procedure, and even new names, in all the branches of the public administration, in order to disturb souls and outrage the Church; and now you are looking up the old doctrines, long since condemned, of the Van Espens and the Giannones, as well as the ordinances of the Josephs, the Leopolds, and the Tanuccis—doctrines against which the Catholic Church, by the mouth of so many of her Sovereign Pontiffs, of her bishops and of her schools, has never ceased to protest, pointing them out as contrary to justice, absurd, scandalous, worthy of eternal condemnation. Thus, while you are priding yourselves on your new civilization, and on the great progress you have made, all that you do, when the Catholic Church is concerned, is to retrograde many years, many centuries." The venerable bishops of Naples conclude by beseeching the King of Sardinia to give ear for once to the protestations of bishops who, in order to fulfil a duty of conscience, raise their voice on behalf of religion and of justice.

This noble protest of the Neapolitan Episcopate is as full of courage as of wisdom. The evidence therein set forth as to the conduct of the Sardinian Government in the Neapolitan States is an additional token, among many that have been recently appearing, that a kingdom obtained by treachery and fraud is not likely to be governed with honour and justice. The dishonest and tyrannical manner in which the Catholic Church is being treated in the Neapolitan States speaks ill for the character of the men who govern in Sardinia. Proofs of late have been accumulating against them; and their own recorded admissions of double-dealing and hypocrisy are now being produced to their condemnation. A very singular work, for instance, has just been published in Piedmont, which discloses some curious facts as to the conduct and character of public men in Sardinia during the progress of the Revolution at Naples. It is a book by Cavaliere Bianca, containing official proofs of the complicity of Count Cavour in Garibaldi's expedition against the Two Sicilies. It produces letters from Cavour, giving full authority to La Farina to direct the expedition, with orders to despatch arms and money to Garibaldi, Consenz, and Medici. Orders are also shown directing the Prefect of Genoa not to oppose the expedition. Farini, the dictator of the Æmilian provinces, is told to leave at Genoa convoys of rifled arms, from the arsenal of Modena, for the use of this nefarious expedition. The two deputies, Bottero and Casalis, are despatched, each with 500,000 francs to aid the insurrection. The most conclusive proofs are given of the shameless effrontery of this minister, who, in the *Official Gazette*, dared to deny all co-operation on the part of the government with this expedition. In addition to the letters and despatches of Cavour, there are letters from the Marquis Villamarina, Sardinian Ambassador at Naples; letters of Admiral Persano, who having received an order from Cavour couched in dubious terms, but meaning in reality that he should place his ships between the vessels of Garibaldi and the Neapolitan cruisers, answered, "I understand you; I will execute your orders, but you may send me to-morrow, if you like, to Fenistrelle" (the political prison). In a recent debate in the Turinese Chambers General Bixio alluded to this mission of Admiral Persano in the Neapolitan waters. We will quote

the sixty-nine prelates (two cardinals, fifteen archbishops, forty-seven bishops, and five capitular vicars) demonstrate in clear and forcible terms that this decree is a flagrant violation, not only of the rights of the Church, but of the liberty of religion, guaranteed by human laws, and of the constitutional statute promulgated at Turin. The venerable prelates remind the king that since, by the Divine mercy, he was regenerated at the baptismal font and brought up in the principles of Catholicism, he must know very well that the Catholic Church is a mystical body, of which our Lord is the Head, and the faithful are the members; and that Jesus Christ had left a Vicar on earth in order that this visible Church should also have a visible head to govern it in all things which concern faith, morals, discipline, and the salvation of souls. After this statement, the bishops of Naples tell the King of Sardinia that the royal decree, which they beseech him to revoke, will cut off the free communication between the head of the Church and its members—a communication indispensable for the preservation of the life of the mystical body. Does not this proceeding, they ask, aggravate the offences already committed in this unhappy Italy against the Church—persecuted in the persons of a great number of her ministers, despoiled of the greater part of her property, and now threatened with a terrible blow, which aims at nothing less than to separate the head from the body? If, they argue, the right of self-preservation is recognized by the natural law as belonging to all beings, even the most vile, how can men deny an equal right to the Catholic Church, which is the most noble of all, as well on account of the Divinity of her Founder as for the inestimable value of her treasures, the sanctity of her chief members, and the importance of her last end? After warning the king against the flatterers of the civil power, the prelates declare that the decree which occupies their attention is even in open contradiction to the statute of the constitution. “This statute enacts that the Catholic religion is the sole religion of the State; that is, that in all things concerning faith, morals, and discipline, the Sovereign Roman Pontiff has the right to command, and that the Italians are under the obligation of obedience. How then can you now seek to abolish that which has been enacted in this article, and treat as strangers, even as enemies, the Pope, the bishops, and the regular prelates, only because they do not reside in a place subject to the royal authority?—how forbid the observance of their ordinances until they have received the Royal Exequatur? Where then,” they ask, “under the Constitutional Government, is the liberty of which so much boast has been made? And what is worse,” they continue, “is that in these calamitous times we see Anglican, Zwinglian, and Calvinist ministers infecting Italy, erecting pulpits, from which they preach error, circulating pernicious books, and striving to unchristianize the people. These men have surely not obtained the royal consent to undertake the mission which has been confided to them by sects hostile to Catholicism from beyond the sea, or from the other side of the Alps. To these sects full liberty is granted. How, then, can that which is permitted to religious sects not be permitted by the constitution, be denied to the veritable Church of Christ? Is it to be the sole Church of the State? If it will, let it have the full liberty of action. Exequatur and Placet have been in force in Italy for centuries. For what reason, then, that they should not be so now?”

aversion professed at the present day against ancient systems? Is it not said that we live in an age of progress? You abrogate the codes which were in force a few years ago; you introduce new laws and new modes of procedure, and even new names, in all the branches of the public administration, in order to disturb souls and outrage the Church; and now you are looking up the old doctrines, long since condemned, of the Van Espens and the Giannones, as well as the ordinances of the Josephs, the Leopolds, and the Tanuccis—doctrines against which the Catholic Church, by the mouth of so many of her Sovereign Pontiffs, of her bishops and of her schools, has never ceased to protest, pointing them out as contrary to justice, absurd, scandalous, worthy of eternal condemnation. Thus, while you are priding yourselves on your new civilization, and on the great progress you have made, all that you do, when the Catholic Church is concerned, is to retrograde many years, many centuries.” The venerable bishops of Naples conclude by beseeching the King of Sardinia to give ear for once to the protestations of bishops who, in order to fulfil a duty of conscience, raise their voice on behalf of religion and of justice.

This noble protest of the Neapolitan Episcopate is as full of courage as of wisdom. The evidence therein set forth as to the conduct of the Sardinian Government in the Neapolitan States is an additional token, among many that have been recently appearing, that a kingdom obtained by treachery and fraud is not likely to be governed with honour and justice. The dishonest and tyrannical manner in which the Catholic Church is being treated in the Neapolitan States speaks ill for the character of the men who govern in Sardinia. Proofs of late have been accumulating against them; and their own recorded admissions of double-dealing and hypocrisy are now being produced to their condemnation. A very singular work, for instance, has just been published in Piedmont, which discloses some curious facts as to the conduct and character of public men in Sardinia during the progress of the Revolution at Naples. It is a book by Cavaliere Bianca, containing official proofs of the complicity of Count Cavour in Garibaldi's expedition against the Two Sicilies. It produces letters from Cavour, giving full authority to La Farina to direct the expedition, with orders to despatch arms and money to Garibaldi, Consenz, and Medici. Orders are also shown directing the Prefect of Genoa not to oppose the expedition. Farini, the dictator of the Æmilian provinces, is told to leave at Genoa convoys of rifled arms, from the arsenal of Modena, for the use of this nefarious expedition. The two deputies, Bottero and Casalis, are despatched, each with 500,000 francs, to aid the insurrection. The most conclusive proofs are given of the shameless effrontery of this minister, who, in the *Official Gazette*, dared to deny all co-operation on the part of the government with this expedition. In addition to the letters and despatches of Cavour, there are letters from the Marquis Villamarina, Sardinian Ambassador at Naples; letters of Admiral Persano, who having received an order from Cavour couched in dubious terms, but meaning in reality that he should place his ships between the vessels of Garibaldi and the Neapolitan cruisers, answered, “I understand you; I will execute your orders, but you may send me to-morrow, if you like, to Fenistrelle” (the political prison). In a recent debate in the Turinese Chambers General Bixio alluded to this mission of Admiral Persano in the Neapolitan waters. We will quote

his words to show with what cynical effrontery he unmasks the hypocrisy of his former supporters. "When," said General Bixio, "we were at Palermo—but it is painful for me to speak of things which ought perhaps to be passed over in silence, yet when facts are cited, I must meet them by others—when, I say, we were at Palermo, I was often sent to Vice-Admiral Persano on matters of a difficult and delicate nature; had they transpired, the succour and aid which we had received from the Government would have been discovered, and such a discovery might have disturbed the course of events. Persano, who might have been disavowed at any moment, took all upon himself, and acted with courage." According to the avowal, then, of one of its own chiefs, the Garibaldian expedition did receive assistance and succour from the Piedmontese Government, which had protested its innocence before all Europe.

The following letter of Cavour's, written at a date when friendly relations were existing between the Governments of Naples and Sardinia, is a striking testimony of the deceit and dishonesty of the latter. It is addressed to Admiral Persano, congratulating him on the success of Garibaldi.

"Turin, 28th July, 1860.

"I rejoice at the victory of Milazzo, which has done honour to the Italian arms, and which ought to convince Europe that the Italians are henceforth resolved to gain at all costs their country and their liberty. I beg you to present my very warm and sincere congratulations to General Garibaldi. I do not see how they can prevent him from passing over to the continent. So much the better if the Neapolitans have accomplished, or, at least, commenced, the work of regeneration; but if they will not, or cannot, budge, then let Garibaldi do as he likes. The enterprise must not remain half-finished. The national flag unfurled in Sicily must be set up in the kingdom of Naples, and carried along the shores of the Adriatic until it floats over the walls of the queen of that sea. Present my compliments also to Medici and to Malanchini, who have conducted themselves admirably."

"CAVOUR."

At the very time at which this letter was written, Cavour, it must be remembered, was publicly treating with the ambassadors whom King Francis II. had sent to Turin. He hoped that the negotiations would be broken off; he feared that the Neapolitans would not *budge*; but, finding out at last that they were not the men he took them for, that they would not become traitors to their king and country, he launched Garibaldi against the kingdom of Naples. What an episode does not this form in the history of the Italian Revolution! Here we see Cavour, the double-dealing minister of Sardinia, employing such men for his confidential agents as Garibaldi and the traitor Liborio Romano, who, as prime minister of the King of Naples, betrayed his master in secret, and afterwards boasted that his was the hand which transferred the crown of Francis to Victor Emmanuel! This work of Cavaliere Bianca has appeared at an opportune moment. There are traitors now at Rome as there were at Naples. The Fausti trial has at least brought one such to light, and has shown us clearly that Piedmont is as unscrupulous in the means which it now uses against Rome, as it was in the time of Cavour, when it plotted in secret for the overthrow of the throne of Naples.

On the first of August, the anniversary of his expulsion, the Cardinal Archbishop of Naples addressed a letter to the clergy and faithful of his diocese.

The archbishop puts under interdict five of the churches of Naples in which divine service was performed by secular priests and monks without the authority of the diocesan, and in spite of his repeated remonstrances. These churches are, Santa Brigitta, Gesù Nuovo, Santa Maria, La Nunziatella, and San Francesco di Paulo. Some of these churches had belonged to religious communities expelled by the Piedmontese and, on their expulsion, they came under the jurisdiction of the ordinary. The Government had handed over these churches to priests and monks known for the extravagance of their political views, who have now rebelled against the authority of their bishop by performing the sacred rites without his authorization. The Cardinal Archbishop declares that every priest who shall preach, hear confessions, or say mass in any one of those churches, or perform any service whatsoever, is, *ipso facto*, suspended. He points out the dangers of impiety and Protestantism, and against their seductive influences he warns the faithful to be on their guard. He then expresses the deep grief he feels in living so far away from his flock. The "liberal" priests, as they are called, of these five churches which are placed under interdict, have published an article in their journal, *L'Emancipatore*, in which they declare that a great religious revolution is about to take place in Italy which, in explaining, with the gospel in its hand, the true sense of certain precepts of our Lord, will light a flame which shall chase away all darkness and abuses. Such are the sentiments of the priests whom the Piedmontese government installs in the finest churches of Naples. Clerical Liberalism, it appears from trustworthy accounts, is making great strides towards Protestantism; in Milan, where a great number of priests are adopting revolutionary principles, Protestantism is making alarming progress. But in Naples, on the other hand, though they are building Protestant churches and propagating anti-Catholic views with the help of suspended priests, Protestantism and irreligion have little effect on the faith and no hold on the mind of the people. The zeal of the clergy is redoubled, and the people flock to the churches. On the Feast of the Assumption every church and chapel was crowded; every shrine of the Blessed Virgin was surrounded by devout petitioners. The lamps were lighted before her image at the corner of almost every street; processions were made in her honour, and the country people came into the city to visit her shrines, preceded by the cross, and reciting her litany, or chaunting hymns in her praise. During the last three years the clergy of Naples have held themselves aloof both from the revolution and from the reaction, and have devoted their energies almost exclusively to the spread of popular devotion and religious knowledge among the people. Religious confraternities have been instituted; charitable associations and associations for prayer have been set on foot, and have already been attended with happy results. Cardinal Sforza, exiled by the Piedmontese, watches from a distance over his flock, and never loses sight of their spiritual interests. The interdict of the five churches in Naples has produced a salutary effect upon the people. The order, likewise, of the Grand Penitentiary, counselling and warning all priests who have unhappily fallen for a time under evil influences, and have violated their obedience to their spiritual superiors and to the Holy See, to make a public retraction of their errors, is bringing, at least in the Neapolitan states, many priests to a sense of their duty.

In the meantime, the Government is pursuing with renewed hostility bishops and priests. The Cardinal Archbishop and his vicar are cited to appear before tribunals to answer for having published Papal bulls without the royal exequatur. But the Archbishop is already in exile: what further persecution the Piedmontese government have in reserve for him and his flock time will show; but we may be certain that the more the religious spirit revives the fiercer will be the raucour of its enemies.

PIEDMONT AND ITALY.—In the Parliament of Turin, during the last session, one occurrence seems to warrant special notice: viz., the characteristic attempt on the part of F. Passaglia to introduce a bill to regulate the relations between the Church and State.

But perhaps, in the first instance, it would be of service to say a word as to the constitution of this Turinese Chamber of Deputies. Each deputy represents, according to the electoral law, 50,000 citizens. But out of forty "Colleges," which were recently examined for the purpose of verifying the elections, it was found that in eight, representing about 400,000 citizens, the electors were registered to the number of only 8,640; in eight other colleges, 7,908; in eight others, 7,873; in eight more, 8,658; and in the last eight, 8,418. Thus it appeared, that in the forty colleges, representing about two millions of citizens, there were only 41,497 electors registered; *i. e.* little more than two per cent. of the population had claimed the power of electing their representatives. But this is not all: only a little more than half of the registered electors came forward to vote. Out of 41,497 registered electors, representing forty colleges, only 20,050 voted; and of these 20,050 votes, 14,155 were given to forty deputies elected; that is to say, each deputy, who ought to represent 50,000 citizens, has been elected, on an average, by about 354 votes. But even this is not the whole truth: in the Turinese parliament there are deputies who have been returned by fewer than 100 votes.

With these figures before us:—out of 50,000 persons, 1,000 registered electors; out of 50,000 persons, 500 voters; and a representative of 50,000 persons elected by 350 votes; and some deputies elected by fewer than 100 votes—with the insight which these figures give us into the constitution of the Turinese Chamber, we are warranted in believing that that body does not actually represent the feelings, the wishes, and the principles of the Italian people. The Turinese Chamber represents the small, but active, minority; it is the product of bureaucratic action. Few of the great lords of the soil are present in those Chambers; few of the great historic names of Italy are enrolled in their lists. Doctors, lawyers, and professors, the unhealthy overgrowth of the unlucrative professions, fill the seats, and speak in the name of those who, had they the moral courage or the active energy which the true sense of responsibility inspires, would now control events and reverse the policy of Piedmont. But the long-continued hostility of these Chambers to religion is another evidence of the indolence and moral cowardice of the well-disposed in Italy,—of men who in their hearts and in their private lives are true to their faith, yet stir not hand or foot to save their country from drifting to destruction.

In such an assembly Passaglia introduced his bill, the provisions of which

would have subjected the Church completely to the power of the State, and would have compelled the clergy to receive a State education. By one of the enactments of the bill, every priest who would not bind himself by an oath "not to oppose, directly or indirectly, the independent unity of Italy," was to be outlawed; by another the same penalty was to be inflicted on every priest who rejected the State system of education. The speech in which he introduced his motion was listened to with weariness by the Chambers. He declares himself to be a Catholic, and yet denies that he is excommunicated. "Gentlemen," he said, "neither you nor I are excommunicated. It is not man who excommunicates, it is Christ by Peter; and at Rome it is not Peter who has spoken, it is man." "I am not excommunicated, I am not excommunicated," is the cry of the unhappy man; but even the members who listened to him knew, without pitying him in his feeble struggle, that he was at that moment under the ban of the Church. In this same spirit he admitted that the universal Episcopate supports the Pope. "*The Catholic Episcopate*," he said, "aroused almost to a man, has preached a crusade against us and against our conduct. It has proclaimed us wicked, usurpers, sacrilegious; and that our conduct has been evil, criminal, impious, and worthy of all the judgments of heaven and earth. To this decision, almost universal, of the Episcopate, the voice of no small part of the laity of Europe has joined itself. Yes; it is notorious and indisputable that in France, in Germany, in Belgium, in England, a vast number of the laity have sympathised with their bishops." But with Passaglia the independent unity of Italy was the dominant idea; to this everything, no matter how sacred, was sacrificed. The Church must bow down before his views. He boasted that he had the secret support of eight or ten thousand priests in Italy. He was the head of a rising and influential party. Into the examination of this extravagant and false assertion we will not now enter. It is enough to know that there is a section, though not large, of the clergy in some parts of Italy, and more especially among some of the capitular bodies, which is unfaithful in its allegiance to the Holy See; and which, out of timidity or self-seeking, endeavours to win the good graces of the party hostile to the Church. On the occasion of the national fête, when there was no legal compulsion to sing the *Te Deum*, this spirit of compromise, or of worse, was conspicuous in some quarters. At Milan, for instance, out of 22 canons and 25 vicars, 5 canons and 10 vicars were present in the Dome to sing the *Te Deum*. Between the real state of feeling among a section of the Italian clergy and Passaglia's boast of adherence, there is a wide discrepancy in point of numbers. Passaglia's bill, however, was rejected, and the reception he had met with so wounded his vanity that he has since, we understand, never set his foot in the chamber.

Of the disorganized state of Italy under the rule of Victor Emmanuel, and of its rapid demoralization, there can no longer be any doubt. The testimony as to open attacks upon religion, and the systematic persecution of the clergy, is too direct and various to admit of denial. At the Congress of Malines, Sgr. Casoni, who had just left Bologna, stated that in Italy 6,000 priests had been driven from their parishes, 1,200 religious houses suppressed, 50 bishops incarcerated or exiled from their sees. To obtain, he said, the blessing of his venerated bishop, before leaving, he had to kneel on the flagstones of a prison.

But we can need no better testimony as to the state of Italy than the Encyclical Letter lately addressed to the Italian bishops. This papal letter begins by speaking of the savage and sacrilegious war which is now being waged against the Catholic Church in almost every country of the world, and especially in unhappy Italy, where from day to day it is growing more deadly. It then alludes to the lamentable manner in which the bishops are vexed by all kinds of injustice and violence, torn from their flocks, driven into exile, and even thrown into prison; as also to the consolation which their conduct affords by the way in which, in spite of the persecutions of the Piedmontese government, they defend the cause, the rights, the teaching of Christ, of His Church, and of the Holy See. It dwells on the prevailing demoralization brought about by impious writings, infamous and obscene in character, by theatrical representations, and by other most shameless means of corruption. It speaks of monstrous and horrible errors disseminated far and wide; of the increasing and abominable indulgence in all manner of vice and profligacy; of the deadly poison of indifference and incredulity so widely diffused; of the contempt for ecclesiastical authority, for all holy things and sacred laws; of unjust spoliations and savage persecutions against priests and nuns; and, in fine, of the truly satanic hate which is manifested against Christ, His Church and teaching, and against the Holy See. The Encyclical Letter points out, also, although not with exclusive reference to Italy, as characteristic of the times, that unbridled passion with which so many men, without paying the least regard to their neighbour, seek their own ease and profit; that insatiate desire for wealth and power which drives men on, regardless of honesty and justice, to heap up riches, and, forgetful of God, of religion, and their souls, to place all their happiness in the pursuit of these earthly ends. The Encyclical Letter then speaks of the grief which the Holy Father feels in seeing that many of the clergy, secular and regular, in Italy, have so far forgotten their sacred vocation as, even in writings, to spread false doctrines and to excite the minds of men against the Holy See, and to support, by all the means in their power, the worst enemies of the Church. These ecclesiastics, it says, separating themselves from their Bishops and from the Holy See, and protected by the favour of the Sub-Alpine government and its officials, have reached such a pitch of audacity, as, in despite of all ecclesiastical censures and penalties, to set up such detestable societies as the Clerico-liberal Society, the Society for Mutual Succour and for the Emancipation of Italian Priests, and others of a like bad spirit; and although their bishops have justly forbidden them to exercise their sacred ministry, they have nevertheless not feared to exercise it, intruders as they were, in many of the churches. After condemning all such societies, and exhorting these unhappy priests to do penance and to return to their duty, the Encyclical Letter concludes by passing a high eulogium on the Italian episcopate for the faith and zeal which have added such glory to their names, as well as on the clergy of Italy, who, in being true to the chair of Peter and to their bishops, have suffered with great patience many tribulations, and admirably fulfilled their duty. A like praise is bestowed on the people of Italy, who, filled with Catholic sentiments, and detesting the impious machinations directed against the Church, esteem it a great honour to pay their tribute of filial piety and respect to the Sovereign Pontiff, and never

fail, harassed and hampered as they are, to show, in many ways, the affection and veneration which they entertain for the Holy See.

To this just and vivid statement of the sufferings and dangers of Italy, nothing can be added. It is only to be hoped that all Catholics will participate with hopeful confidence in the Holy Father's conviction, that the full triumph of religion, truth, and justice, though adjourned for a time, will not be long delayed; and will thus be brought heartily to unite their efforts for its speedy realization.

We had prepared an abstract of F. Vaughan's proposal for the foundation in England of a Seminary for Foreign Missions, as brought before the Congress of Malines, with the approbation of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and since published (in French) in a circular, a second edition of which has reached us; but we regret that want of space compels us to defer its insertion. We will only observe that the institution is intended for the education, not of our own countrymen only, but of persons from every nation, even converted heathens,—*e.g.*, Chinese, negroes, &c.,—who may possess the requisite vocation.

* * We desire to correct an error that found its way into the article in our last number on the "Work and the Wants of the Catholic Church in England." Among the lesser Catholic colleges, the Jesuit college at S. Beuno's was by mistake included. We regret the oversight, as S. Beuno's, as a house of studies, has a high and peculiar character.

INDEX.

ABYSSINIAN SCHISM, the, 33-65 ; deserving attention on several grounds, 33 ; Abyssinia for many ages one empire ; broken up into three divisions in 16th century, 34-36 ; lately re-united ; legend of its connection with Judea, 34, 35 ; Jewish dynasty, 36 ; conversion to Christianity in the 4th century ; names of missionaries held in special reverence, 36, 37 ; adopts the Monophysite heresy, 38 ; honours the heresiarch Dioscorus as a saint, 38-41 ; constitution of Abyssinian Church, 41-44 ; the *deberahs*, or learned class, 43, 44 ; canon of Scripture, 44 ; heresy of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father only, 44 ; controversy concerning a threefold birth of Christ, 45-48 ; invocation of saints, 37-40, 49 ; devotion to the Blessed Virgin, 49, 50 ; purgatory, 50, 51 ; baptismal ceremonies, 51, 52 ; celebration of Epiphany, 52 ; Sacraments of penance, confirmation, and extreme unction, 53 ; marriage, 53, 54 ; the Holy Eucharist, 54-58 ; traces of Judaism, 58-62 ; the calendar, 61, 62 ; fasts, 62 ; hostility to the Catholic Church and to the Holy See, 63-65 ; labours of the Jesuits, 63 ; and other Catholic missionaries, 65.

Acarie (Mme.), par G. de Cadoudal, *noticed*, 243.

Agnès de Jésus (V.), Vie de la, par M. de Lantanges, *noticed*, 238-240.

Anderdon (Rev. W. H.), the Adventures of Owen Evans, *noticed*, 563, 564.

Anselm (S.), Dr. Hook's misrepresentations as to his character and conduct, 287-311.

BENEDETTA Medolago Albani, *Memorie di*, *noticed*, 260, 261.

Bianca (Cavaliere), on the Revolution at Naples, 606, 607.

Blomfield (Dr. C. J.), a Memoir of, by his son, A. Blomfield, *noticed*, 256, 257.

Blot (Rev. P.), *Les Auxiliatrices du Purgatoire*, *noticed*, 566, 567.

Bouix (Rev. P. Marcel), *Œuvres Spirituelles de S. Pierre d'Alcantara*, *noticed*, 547-550.

— *La Solitaire des Rochers*, *noticed*, 550-553.

Brogie (A. de), A paper on Universal Suffrage, in *Le Correspondant*, *analysed*, 270, 271.

Burgon (Rev. John W.), Letters from Rome to Friends in England ; his arguments against Prayers for the Dead refuted, 411-418.

CADOUDAL (G. de), Mme. Acarie, *noticed*, 243.

CATHOLIC CONGRESS OF MALINES, the, 482-493 ; its importance, 482 ; its object and work, 483-485 ; programme of subjects, 485-487 ; its im-

- diat effect, 487, 488 ; M. de Montalembert's speeches : reflections on the appeals to the progress of modern society, 488-491 ; the University of Louvain, 492 ; the lay speakers, 492, 493 ; sympathy with the Church in England, 493.
- Cartier (E.), Dialogue de S. Catharine de Sienne, *noticed*, 545-547.
- Lettres de S. Catharine de Sienne, *noticed*, 546, 547.
- Vie de Fra Angelico de Fiesole, *noticed*, 542-545.
- Church Establishment in Ireland, pamphlet on the, *noticed*, 251, 252.
- Church in Spain, sufferings of the, 28, 29 ; its prospects, 31.
- Civilization, ancient and modern, article on, in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, *analysed*, 579-582 ; what civilization is, 580 ; the product of the Church, 581, 582.
- Civiltà Cattolica* (La), *analysed*, 262-270, 575-582.
- Colenso (Dr.) and the Anglican Church, a paper on, in *Le Correspondant*, by the Abbé Meignan, *analysed*, 271, 272.
- Confraternities, religious, in Spain, 14-18.
- Constitutionalism, Continental notions of, 29, 30, 264.
- Correspondant* (Le), *analysed*, 270-274, 570-575.
- Crema (John of), Cardinal-legate, Dr. Hook's misrepresentations as to the private life of, 285-287.
- Croiset (Rev. P.), Devotion to the Sacred Heart, *noticed*, 261, 262.
- CURÉ OF ARS, the, 322-355 ; the world's estimate of the Beatitudes, 322 ; the Curé's family, 323-325 ; his childhood, 325-328 ; his intellectual mediocrity, 329, 330 ; he is drawn for the conscription, and providentially escapes, 330, 331 ; justification of his conduct, 331, 332 ; he enters the seminary of Verrières, 333 ; difficulties attending his admission to the priesthood, 333, 334 ; becomes assistant-priest at Ecully, 334 ; is appointed Curé of Ars, 335 ; his devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 336-338, 339-341 ; zeal in preaching, 338, 339 ; establishment of confraternities, 341 ; adornment of his church, 343, 344 ; orphanage of the Providence, 344 ; catechetical instructions, 344 ; pilgrimage of Ars, 345, 346 ; the beauty of holiness, 346-348, 351 ; he is subjected to scoffs and calumny, 348-350 ; self-sacrifice the law of intellectual and moral progress, 351, 352 ; the Curé's practical knowledge, 352, 353 ; his winning qualities, 353, 354 ; and continued life of prayer, 354, 355.
- DANCING before the Blessed Sacrament in Spain, 11, 32 ; in religious ceremonies in Abyssinia, 60.
- Dangers attending the present position of Catholics in England, 160-166.
- Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, nature of his errors, 38-40 ; enrolled among the saints of the Abyssinian calendar, 40.
- DOGMATIC PRINCIPLE, the, 458-481 ; dislike of it among the educated classes, 458 ; the question discussed as between Catholic and Liberal, 459-472 ; the moral value of an act measured by its motive, 460, 461 ; the desire of conforming to the will of God, the highest possible motive, 461 ; the deplorable condition of an atheist, 462-464 ; ignorance of the Incarnation a very great calamity : condition of a Catholic and a Unitarian contrasted, 464-467 ; the necessity of doctrinal definitions, 467-470 ;

and of scientific accuracy, 470-472 ; the liberal theory immoral and anti-Christian, 473, 474 ; ineffectual attempt to discover Dr. Stanley's counter proposition, 475-478 ; his statement as to Assurance being an abstract doctrine examined, 478-480 ; the world's estimate of Christian morality, 479-481.

Drama of the Passion in Spain, 19.

EDUCATION, Catholic, effect of the Reformation on, in England, 141, 142 ; a more adequate provision needed for all classes, 149.

— duty of civil government with respect to, 87, 95, 96.

— female, true Catholic idea of, 114-117, 132.

— state of, in Abyssinia, 44.

Epiphany, mode of celebrating the feast of, in Abyssinia, 52.

Esprite de Jésus (B.), *Vie de la*, par le R. P. Fr. Ambroise Potton, *noticed*, 240, 241.

ESSAYS AND MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS : object of this department in the REVIEW, 167.

Eucharist, Holy, doctrine and celebration of, in Abyssinia, 54-58.

Études Religieuses, Historiques, et Littéraires, analysed, 568-570.

Eutyches, his heresy, 38.

FABER (Very Rev. F.), Translation of V. Grignon de Montfort's treatise on the true Devotion to the Blessed Virgin, *noticed*, 259, 260.

Fausti Trial, the, 592-601.

Ford's Handbook for Spain, its untruthfulness, 13.

Formby (Rev. H.), Inquiry of a retired Citizen into the Roman Catholic Religion, *noticed*, 248, 249.

Francesca de Maistre, *la Vita egli Scritti di*, *noticed*, 260, 261.

FOREIGN EVENTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST, object of this department in the REVIEW, 582, 583.

Fraser (A. C.), Rev. J. Robertson's Narrative of a Secret Mission to the Danish Islands, edited by, *noticed*, 252-255.

FRENCH ELECTIONS, 191-219 ; changes in the Cabinet, 191-194 ; retrospective view of the Elections of 1857, 194-198 ; a meeting of French Catholics, in 1859, 199, 200 ; connection between the religious agitation of 1859 and 1860 and the Elections of 1863, 200, 201 ; M. de Persigny's preparatory measures, 203, 204 ; M. de la Guéronnière and the journal *La France*, 204-206 ; combination of newspapers, 207, 208 ; details of a French election, 209 ; apathy of practical Catholics, 208, 210 ; electoral strategy of the Government : candidature and defeat of M. de Montalembert, 211-213 ; and of other Catholic leaders, 213-215 ; question as to the effect of the elections of 1863 on the Government and the nation, 215-219.

Froude (Hurrell), character of, 168, 172-174 ; his influence with Mr. Newman, 168 ; his opinion of the Reformers, 175 ; effect of Oxford studies in the formation of his mental habits, 180 ; change in his opinions, 187 ; publi-

cation of his "Remains," 187; question as to his probable conversion considered, 188-190.

Frumentius, Apostle of Abyssinia, 36, 37.

GARRUCCI (Padre), Cimitero degli Antichi Ebrei, scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini, *reviewed*, 397-418.

— Vetri Ornati di Figure in Oro, trovati nei Cimiteri dei Cristiani Primitivi di Roma, 401.

Godard (M.), *Principes de* '89, 110.

Gonzalez de Leon (Don Felix), *History of Religious Confraternities in Seville*, 15.

GOVERNMENT, CIVIL, INTRINSIC END OF, 66-111; object of the inquiry, 67; its difficulties, 67-69; conclusions to which the argument is directed, 69, 70; meaning of the terms "temporal good," and "moral and spiritual good," 70, 71; constitution and authority of civil government, 71-74; methods of promoting spiritual good which are beyond the State's competence, 74-79; the fundamental thesis, 79; supplementary thesis, 79, 80; explanations of these, 80, 81; negative proofs: no way of promoting a nation's permanent temporal good, except by advancing its spiritual welfare, 83-93; opposing theory considered, first in reference to the universally admitted functions of government, 85-89; marriage contract, 85-87; education, 87; endowments, 87; property, 87, 88; immoral publications, 88; capital punishment, 88; secondly, in reference to those principles of morality which reason, by itself, can recognise, 89-92; divorce of politics from religion, what the principle really is, 90-92; intellectual good a legitimate object of desire, 193; positive proofs in favour of the general argument, 93-97; all action of the civil government the corporate action of the community, 93; influence of the civil ruler, 93, 94; his peculiar relation to the people, 94; he cannot be neutral in regard to their spiritual welfare, 94-96; no religious man could act on the opposite theory, 97; objections considered, 97-104; end of civil government, immediate and ultimate, 102-104; comp. 220-224; ecclesiastical testimony to the doctrine advanced, 104-110; Gregory XVI., 106; S. Thomas, 106, 107; Suarez, 106-109; M. Godard, 110; practical application has still to be treated, 111.

Gregory XVI., encyclical "Mirari Vos," 69, 79, 106.

Grignon de Montfort (V.), *Treatise on the True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin*, *noticed*, 259, 260.

HARRIS (Major), *The Highlands of Ethiopia*, 33.

Hierarchy, restoration of the, in England, advantages resulting from, 145-149.

Home Life of English Ladies in the 17th century, 115.

Hook (Dr.), *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, *reviewed*, 275-321; spirit and character of the work, 275-278; blunders from ignorance or prejudice, 278-287; specially as to Lanfranc, 278, 279; on the subject of the marriage of priests, 280-284; bishops' secular courts, 284, 285;

and the private life of the Cardinal-legate, John of Crema, 285-287 ; misrepresentations as to S. Anselm's character and conduct, 287-311 ; specially in his demanding from Rufus the restitution of Church lands, 289-291 ; in making him an offering of money, 291, 292 ; in urging him to allow the election of abbots, 295, 296 ; in recognising Urban II. as Pope, and receiving from him the pallium, 296-305 ; the saint's contest with Henry II. about investiture, 305-310 ; the circumstances of his death, 310, 311 ; advocacy of Erastian principles, 303, 304, 312 ; misstatements in relating the dispute between Ralph of Canterbury and Thurstan of York, 312-316 ; and the contest between S. Thomas and Henry II., 316-319 ; errors in the account given of Archbishop Baldwin, and of Henry's death, 319-321 ; the work of no historical value, 321.

Hospital of the Caridad at Seville, 25-27.

Hutchison's (F.) Holy House of Loreto, 262.

INTELLECTUAL GOOD a legitimate object of desire, 93.

Italy, disorganized state of, under Victor Emmanuel, 610-612 ; female education in, 122-124 ; secret societies in, 594-601.

JACOBIS (Mgr. de), his missionary labours in Abyssinia, 34, 65 ; his account of the *deberahs*, or learned class, 43.

Jeanne Marie de la Croix, par Bède Weber ; traduit par Charles Sainte-Foi, *noticed*, 241-243.

Jewish Catacomb newly discovered at Rome, 397-418 ; prominence given by recent historians to the relations of the Church with pagan religions, 397-399 ; relations with contemporary Judaism equally important, 399, 400 ; Jewish cemetery explored by Bosio, 400 ; other cemeteries discovered, 400, 401 ; site and character of the newly discovered catacomb, 401-403 ; examination of the inscriptions, 403-410 ; Mr. Burgon's attempt to use them as an argument against the Church shown to be irrelevant and futile, 411-415 ; the inscriptions confirmatory of Catholic doctrine, 415-418.

Joseph (S.), devotion to, in Spain, 22.

Judaism, vestiges of, in Abyssinia, 45, 54, 58-62.

KEBLE (Rev. J.) contrasted with the other leaders of the Tractarian movement, 172-176 ; his "Christian Year," 179, 180.

Kingsley (Rev. C.), *The Water-Babies*, *noticed*, 257, 258.

Krapf (Rev. Dr.), *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours in Eastern Africa*, 33.

LA FUENTE (Vicente), *Ecclesiastical History of Spain*, 6, 28.

La Guéronnière, made editor of *La France*, 204 ; his character and proceedings, 205-207.

Lamp, the, *noticed*, 262.

Lanfranc (Archbishop), Dr. Hook's misstatements about, 278-284.

Lantages (M. de), *Vie de la V. Mère Agnès de Jésus*, *noticed*, 238-240.

Laprade (V. de), article in *Le Correspondant* on Recent Historians of the Roman Empire, *analysed*, 573-575.

Laymen, Catholic, greater practical efficiency in, needed, 159, 492.

LETTERS OF S. TERESA, the, 419-457; no faithful edition of the Saint's writings till that published by P. Bouix, 419, 420; her letters a commentary on her life, 420-422; the advantages of a chronological arrangement, 422; very many lost from various causes, 423-425; the Saint's life naturally divisible into two periods: of the first period, few letters preserved, 425, 426; beginning of the reform: influence of S. Peter of Alcantara, 426-428; removal to the Convent of S. Joseph, 428; visit of Rossi, the Carmelite General, 429-431; progress of the Reform: the foundations, 431-435; Teresa made prioress of the Convent of the Incarnation, 435-440; historical importance of her letters, 440; attempts on the part of Philip II. to force the Reform on the whole Carmelite body, 441; the papal Visitors, Hernandez and Vargas, 442, 443; Ambrose Mariano and Jerome Gracian, 443-446; Teresa involved in the contest, 441, 442, 446; danger of the Reform, 447; the Nuncio Ormaneto, 448; decree of the General Chapter, dissolving all monasteries of the Reform, 448; the Visitor Tostado: Teresa ordered to remain in one of her convents, 448; the Nuncio Segá: timidity and indecision of Gracian, 450, 451; threatened destruction of the Reform, 452, 453; courage and confidence of the Saint, 453; conclusion of the contest: the Reform erected into a separate province, 454; letters to F. Gracian, 454, 455; Teresa's relations with her own family, 455-457.

Leopardi (G.), his scepticism and peculiar form of melancholy, 570-573.

Literature, Catholic, danger resulting from the absence of a, 161.

Ludolf, History of Æthiopia, 33.

Lyell (Sir C.), The Geological Evidence of the Antiquity of Man, *noticed*, 523-527.

MACCARTHY (D. F.), inquiry as to the editions, &c., of the *Mémoires de la Cour d'Espagne sous le Règne de Charles II.*, par le Marquis de Villars, *noticed*, 255, 256.

Macauley (Lord), his objection as to end of civil government considered, 99, 100.

Macmillan's Magazine, statements of a prejudiced writer in, respecting female education in Italy, 122-124.

Madden (R. R.), Galileo and the Inquisition, *noticed*, 521, 522.

Manning (Mgr.), Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects, *noticed*, 509-511.

Marriage of Priests, Dr. Hook's mistakes about the, in Lanfranc's time, 280-284; not allowed in Abyssinia after ordination, 53, 54.

Marshall (T. W.), Christian Missions, *noticed*, 262.

Mathieu (R. C.), *Livre de Prêtres*, *noticed*, 538-542.

Meignan (l'Abbé), a paper on Colenso and the Anglican Church by, *analysed*, 271, 272.

Mendicity at Rome, 268, 269.

- Missions, foreign, provision for, needed, 159, 160 ; F. Vaughan's proposal to found a seminary in England, 403, 612.
- Montalembert (M. de), his candidature and defeat, 211-213, 274 ; his addresses at the Congress of Malines, 488, 489.
- Morality, Christian, how accepted by the world, 90, 479-481.
- Mortimer-Ternaux, *Histoire de la Terreur*, 575.
- Murray (Rev. Dr.), *Tractatus de Ecclesiâ Christi*, *noticed*, 224, 225.

NATIONAL Good and National Greatness contrasted, 92.

Neapolitan States, the, 604-609.

Newman (Mr., now Very Rev.), Mr. Froude's influence with, 168 ; his relations with the other leaders of the Tractarian Movement, 172-176 ; his ministrations at S. Mary's, 185-187 ; shock occasioned to his views by an article in the DUBLIN REVIEW, 497, 498 ; publication of Tract XC., 499-502 ; letter to Dr. Jelf, 499, 502, 503 ; his influence compared with that of Dr. Pusey's, 503-505 ; no sympathy with the hopes of a corporate union, 508.

OAKELEY (CANON), *HISTORICAL NOTES ON THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT*, Part I., 170-190 ; reasons for calling it "Tractarian," 171, 172 ; Mr. Froude's character described, 168, 172-174 ; characteristics of the different leaders, 174-176 ; prognostics of the movement, 176, 177 ; its proximate causes, 177-181 ; the teaching of Dr. Lloyd, 177-179 ; Keble's "Christian Year," 179, 180 ; the philosophical and classical studies of Oxford, 180, 181 ; objects of the tract-writers, 182, 183 ; Mr. Newman at S. Mary's, 185-187 ; Froude's "Remains," 188 ; question as to the probability of the latter's conversion considered, 187-190.

—— Part II., 494-508 ; prevailing ignorance regarding the English Catholic community, 494-496 ; the DUBLIN REVIEW and the *British Critic*, 497 ; shock occasioned to Mr. Newman's views by an article in the former, 497, 498 ; Tract XC., 499-503 ; Dr. Pusey's influence compared with Mr. Newman's, 503-505 ; Mr. Ward's pamphlets, 505, 507 ; dreams of corporate union, 506-508.

ORSINI (Signor Gaetano), letters of Rosa Ferrucci to, 118-122, 124-127, 128-131, 133.

PARISIS (Mgr.), *Lettre de, à M. Thouvenel*, 66.

Parkinson (Rev. F.), *Education in Itself and in its Relation to Present Wants*, *noticed*, 559-563.

Parkyn (Mansfield), *Life in Abyssinia*, 33.

Passaglia's speech in the Turinese Chamber, 609, 610.

Patriotism, Christian and worldly, contrasted, 91, 92.

Penal laws, effects of, on Catholics, 143.

Perreyre (l'Abbé Henri), *Rosa Ferrucci : ses Lettres et sa Mort*, 111-138.

Persigny (M. de), his electoral tactics, 203, 204 ; 211-213.

Peter of Alcantara (S.), relations of, with S. Teresa, 426-428.

Piedmont and Italy, 609-612.

